

THE
SOUTHWESTERN SOCIAL SCIENCE
QUARTERLY

Vol. XXVII

December, 1946

No. 3

An Analysis of Some of the Propaganda
Features of the Campaign of 1940

HENRY O. EVJEN

ROCKY RIVER HIGH SCHOOL
CLEVELAND, OHIO

On the morning after the election of 1940 Wendell Willkie wired these words to his victorious opponent, "Congratulations on your reelection . . . I know that we are both grateful that so many American citizens participated in the election. I wish you all personal health and happiness."¹ The defeated Republican candidate referred to the fact that the vote was the largest ever cast in this country. This display of the democratic process in a presidential election, favorable as it might seem, was marred, unfortunately, by the excessive bitterness and the questionable tactics by members of both major parties. Norman Thomas, the Socialist Party candidate and a veteran of four campaigns described the 1940 election as the most disgraceful in his career.² Seldom has an American election reached such depths of personal abuse and mud-slinging. Perhaps no election cost as much as this one.³

To describe adequately the propaganda techniques and methods of the 1940 election is in itself a major task. A study of the cartoons alone of this campaign would make an excellent thesis. This paper proposes to study some of the unusual features of the campaign. First, to show how the major political parties circumvented the Hatch Act of 1940; second, to describe the

¹*Scholastic*, 11 Nov. 1940.

²Bone, Hugh A., *Smear Politics*, 5. American Council on Public Affairs, 1941.

³No one knows how much Mark Hanna spent in the presidential election of 1896. Hanna declared that his party spent \$3,500,000. This represents only the amount which passed through national headquarters. Herbert Croly declared "Its total has been grossly exaggerated. It has been estimated as high as \$12,000,000 but such figures have been quoted only by yellow journals and irresponsible politicians. A favored estimate has been \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000."—*Marcus Alonzo Hanna, His Life and Work* (The MacMillan Company, New York, 1912), 220.

growth of the independent political committees; third, to analyze the propaganda of these committees in relation to their techniques and origins.

MEANING OF PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is defined as a method of influencing people to act in a desired way.⁴ The propagandist is a symbol-specialist who often rationalizes a person's emotional drives. He is familiar with a definite psychology which enables him to use such techniques as *derision, omission, false reasoning, name-calling, falsification, and diversion*.⁵ It is he who often evokes the question, "What are the powers, and whose are the invisible hands pulling the strings which make the puppet public dance."⁶

Every political campaign employs a tremendous amount of propaganda which includes everything from campaign buttons to radio speeches. Public opinion specialists play a major role in its activities. A presidential campaign is, moreover, not the product of months of planning but rather of years. Since the privilege of voting carries with it no requirement for the voter to think for himself, the propagandist resorts to all kinds of pressures and propaganda devices. He knows all too well that elections become an emotional release to many people who build themselves up for a tremendous let-down. How disconsolate and deflated is the look which envelops the face of the defeated party worker on the morning after election!

I. THE CIRCUMVENTION OF THE HATCH ACT

Early in 1940 Congress passed the bill introduced by Senator Hatch which limited the expenditures of parties in national elections to \$3,000,000, and the donations of individuals to \$5,000. This measure was one of a series, augmenting the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, proposed to secure "clean politics" in federal elections. To investigate campaign expenditures in light of the Hatch Act, both Houses of Congress created special investigating committees. The one appointed in the lower House, headed by Mr. Whittington, played a minor role in the investigations preferring to allow the committee of the Senate headed by Senator

⁴Henry O. Evjen, *Propaganda, Its Purpose, Techniques and Evaluation* (The National Council on Education for Citizenship, 1939), 2.

⁵These techniques are similar to those used by the Institute of Propaganda Analysis.

⁶Peter Odegard, *The American Public Mind* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1930), VII.

Gillette to make a thorough investigation.⁷ The latter committee held hearings before and after the election, and its report was extremely revealing.⁸

Prior to the campaign the general counsel of the Republican National Committee argued before the Gillette Committee that while the Hatch Act of 1940 limited expenditures of the national party committee to \$3,000,000, additional expenditures could be made by independent committees. The general counsel for the Democratic National Committee admitted the legality of the Republican claim, but asserted that it was the intention of the Congress to include all contributions within the limit set, and that the Democratic National Committee would comply with what it conceived to be the spirit of the act. The Attorney General of the United States refused to render an advisory opinion because of the danger of misinterpretation. Later officials of the Republican party reported to the Gillette Committee that they had tried to discourage all independent committees with the exception of the Associated Willkie Clubs of America. The Democratic party officials reported that they had tried to ascertain the expenditures of the independent committees working for them.⁹ Not long after the campaign of 1940 got underway, it was apparent that the attempts of the national committees to check the expenditures of independent committees were meeting with little success.

The Federal Corrupt Practices Act requires that each party report to the Clerk of the House of Representatives the amount of money spent in national elections. Mention has been made of the expenditures in the election of 1896.¹⁰ The total amount of money reported by the two major parties was in 1928 \$12,500,000. In 1932, \$5,500,000. In 1936 both parties together reported expenditures of \$14,000,000, more than double the 1932 figure. In 1940, the first year in which the Hatch Act was effective, both national committees reported to the Clerk of the House that they

⁷*Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice-presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures.* Feb. 1, 1940. 77 Congress, 1st Session.

⁸Hereafter referred to as the Gillette Committee.

⁹*ibid.* 6.

¹⁰See note 3.

had spent a total of \$4,440,558. Of this amount the Republican party spent \$2,242,721.¹¹

The fact that the national committees of the two major parties had complied with the provisions of the Hatch Act by spending less than three million dollars each was no cause for jubilation. Both had devised several means of circumventing the law. Enormous expenditures were made by independent committees and by individuals. One of the unusual features of the 1940 campaign was the growth of these independent committees. The political club is not new in American politics, but never has there been such a multiplicity of organizations. The Senate Expenditure Committee revealed that the total reported as spent in the 1940 election by national, state and independent committees amounted to \$22,740,000. Less than 5% of the independent agencies reported their expenditures as required by law.¹² The *New York Times* on January 25, 1941 stated that Mr. Hatch was horrified by the expenditures "which conservatives have put at \$40,000,000 but which some have estimated at \$60,000,000."

Both national committees resorted to the practice of dividing funds among several state committees. The Democratic National Committee gave to the Illinois State Committee \$25,000, to the New York Committee \$175,000, and to the New Jersey Committee \$100,000.¹³ Many state committees made transfers to funds of other states. The Tennessee Republican Central Committee transferred to the South Dakota Republican State Committee \$10,000. The Michigan Republican Finance Committee transferred \$21,000 to five other state committees. Numerous other examples are found in the appendices of the Gillette Committee Report.

The \$5,000 limitation on individual donations proved ineffective. Contributions were split among members of a family so that large sums far in excess of the limitation were given. Members of the DuPont family contributed \$186,000, of the Rockefeller family \$59,000, and of the Pew family \$108,000.

¹¹ Louise Overacker, "Campaign Finance in Presidential Elections of 1940," *American Political Science Review*, XXXV, 713.

¹² Gillette Committee Report, 16.

¹³ *ibid*, 10.

The largest independent political committee was the Associated Willkie Clubs of America which reported that it had spent \$1,355,604.¹⁴ It surpassed in its expenditures the Liberty League which supported the Republican Party in 1936. It spent \$518,000, one half the total spent by all auxiliary organizations in the campaign of that year.¹⁵ Incidentally, the expenditures of the Willkie Clubs are not included in the final estimate of the Gillette Committee.

It must be recognized that the intricacies and twists which these evasive methods create make the task of accounting in campaign expenditures a difficult one. In 1936 the Lonergan Expenditure Committee of the House stated, "There is no accounting practice in the United States which presents so many complexities arising from lack of uniformity and completeness as that of political organizations."¹⁶ The Whittington Committee reported to the House of Representatives on March 3, 1941 that "The Hatch Act with respect to threats and intimidation has been beneficial, but in the matter of contributions by individuals and expenditures by parties, there have been all kinds of evasion and juggling. It is not too much to say that the acts themselves are defective, unenforceable and obscure."¹⁷

The conclusions of both Congressional investigating committees agree that the major political parties easily circumvented the Hatch Act of 1940. It is not a difficult task to keep within the law if one can transfer funds, make loans, and contribute as a family unit. The discovery of these methods enabled hundreds of political agencies to carry on propaganda activities which otherwise they would have been unable to do.

II. THE GROWTH OF THE INDEPENDENT POLITICAL COMMITTEE

An independent political committee consists of one or more persons whose organization and activities have no direct connection with the regular organization of political parties. Though

¹⁴*ibid.*, Appendix VII.

¹⁵Louise Overacker, "Campaign Funds in Presidential Election of 1936," *American Political Science Review*, XXXI, 474.

¹⁶*ibid.*, 478.

¹⁷*Report of Campaign Expenditures*, March 3, 1941, 77 Congress, 1 session, 6.

the multiplicity of such committees was one of the unusual features of the 1940 campaign almost every presidential campaign has had them. The Gillette Committee listed the names of 130 independent committees which had made some report of their expenditures.¹⁸ Many more did not comply with the provisions of the law. In Ohio, a pivotal state, the report mentioned 34 committees of which 33 were working in behalf of Wendell Willkie, one in behalf of Roosevelt.¹⁹ One must recognize, in this lack of pro-Roosevelt agencies that the party in power has distinct advantages over the other parties. Its machine is already functioning with thousands of office holders working vigorously for the party. Then, too, who is to decide when a government agency is including political activity in its legal functions?

A partial list of these independent agencies representing the main groups whose activities were scrutinized by the Gillette Committee in the nation included:

1. National Committee for Democrats for Willkie.
2. Associated Willkie Clubs of America.
3. Peoples Committee to Defend Life Insurance and Savings.
4. National Committee for Uphold Constitutional Government.
5. Writers for Wendell Willkie.
6. Willkie Magazine Fund.
7. Independent Business Men for Willkie.
8. Anti-third Term Association.
9. First Voters League, Inc.
10. We, the People.
11. Citizens Information Committee.
12. Clearing House for National Interests.
13. New York County Chapter of National Republican Builders.
14. United Republican Finance Committee for Metropolitan New York.
15. Uptown Lawyers Division of New York.
16. Committee for Metropolitan New York.
17. National Committee of Independent Voters.*²⁰
18. National Committee for Agriculture.*
19. The Committee of Regular Republicans for Reelection of FDR.*
20. Hollywood for Roosevelt Committee.*
21. Democratic State Councils of Italian Origin.*
22. Pro America.
23. Business Man's League.*
24. National Committee of Physicians for Willkie.
25. Willkie War Veterans.
26. Non-Partisan League of Clothing Workers.*
27. Employees for Roosevelt.*

¹⁸Gillette Committee Report, 8.

¹⁹*ibid.*

²⁰The asterisk indicates Roosevelt supporters.

The list does not include the hundreds of unreported organizations throughout the country nor the many labor, women, and professional groups which carried on political activity.²¹

It is interesting to note the role which the one-man committee played in this election. Many people made their homes or offices a distribution point for campaign literature and material, the cost of which they themselves paid. Prominent among these people were Horace W. Davis of Pittsfield, Mass., Robert W. Perkins of New York, Earnest Goerner of Milwaukee, Bob Howdale, Oak Park, Illinois, and many others. The author's collection of 1940 literature has material distributed by twenty individuals. In addition to those who were willing to attach their names to their efforts, there were many who preferred to carry on their activities anonymously.

In the Cleveland area many young people, who were not old enough to vote, organized Junior Willkie Clubs. These clubs played a major role in disseminating literature for the Associated Willkie Clubs of America.

III. THE PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

of the

INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE

No sooner were these committees organized than they at once began to bombard the American public with an assortment of buttons, billboards, cartoons, advertisements, songs, and literature. Decency was no limitation! In this varied production not only every technique of propaganda, but all kinds of scurrilous and vicious items were used. Mental stereotypes or symbols were thrown about with abandon, and appeals to the basic drives such as the desire for new experience, the desire for prestige, the desire for sex, and the desire for security were constantly used. The following pages will analyze the activities of these committees, and show the propaganda devices which they employed.

²¹"In no previous campaign in our history have the non-party agencies been so many and varied as in 1940, and never have they invested so heavily in a campaign." Theodore Cousens, *Politics and Political Organization in U. S.* (The MacMillan Company, New York, 1942), 443.

Buttons: People like to identify themselves with organizations. It appeals to their desire for prestige. One way to show this identity is to wear buttons. In the 1940 campaign the question was not "where is the button," but rather "who wants a button." One magazine commented that the "established policy of never mentioning the name of the opposition candidate has been abandoned this year in the large size novelty buttons with such effusions as Roosevelt for Ex-President."²² One survey predicted that by November "more than 40,000,000 buttons will be distributed," and added that "Willkie buttons are effervescent as a sophomore."²³ Some of the simpler buttons merely carried the picture of one of the candidates, but most of them were embellished with derisive slogans. Included in the list were these:

No Franklin the First
No Koyal Family
No Crown for Franklin
Thanksgiving Day, Nov. 5
We Don't Want Eleanor Either
No More Fireside Chats
Willkie or Bust
We Women Want Willkie
Roosevelt for Ex-President
My Friends but NOT My Subjects
Eight Years is Enough
Roosevelt. No No A Thousand Times
Eleanor. No Soap!
No More New Deal. We Want a Square Deal
If I Were 21, I'd Vote For Willkie
No Third Term For Constitutionalists
No Fourth Term Either
I AM A Willkie Democrat
My Friends, Good Bye
Win What With Willkie
Win With Willkie
Two Good Terms Deserve Another
Roosevelt. Labor's Choice

The origin of these buttons can be traced to three agencies, party organizations, independent political committees and button manufacturers. The last named group, realizing that it had a field day coming, manufactured all types of novelty campaign buttons which were sold to anyone.

²²*New York Times Magazine*, 30 Sept. 1940.

²³*Life*, 7 Oct. 1940.

Advertising: Neither party in 1940 officially spent much on newspaper and billboard advertising. Billboard advertising runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars when a nation-wide campaign is attempted.²⁴ Full page advertisements in newspapers often cost several thousand dollars. Though the Republican National Committee reported that it spent for these two items only \$19,455, there was a preponderance of both in the campaign.²⁵ *Life* magazine carried pictures of fifteen billboard advertisements that appeared in various places throughout the United States. They were in many cases similar to those which one saw in other towns. Most of them indicated that *their* cost had been borne by an independent political agency.

Full page advertisements in newspapers were not uncommon. Most of the metropolitan papers at some time during the campaign carried advertisements, the cost of which were borne by independent agencies. Two groups which paid for rather large amounts of space were the Willkie Magazine Fund and the Committee of Regular Republicans for the Reelection of FDR. The advertisements of both will be discussed later in this paper.

Campaign Antics: The antics of the campaign were carried on largely by independent groups. In DeKalb, Illinois, a funeral procession and burial was carried out by an anti-Roosevelt group in which the coffin carried the label "New Deal" and thousands dressed in black garb made up the funeral procession. In Cleveland elephants marched in a parade adorned with blankets on which anti-third term utterances of men like Newton Baker and Archbishop Schrembs were printed. In New York, thousands of balloons were released by Willkie men who boasted that they contained more hot air than the Democrats had produced to date. Acrobatic shows featured pro-Roosevelt rallies in Indiana. Supporters of Willkie in Virginia observed No Third Term Day on Oct. 23, 1940 by demonstrating with two horses and two people in historic Bull Run that it was possible to change horses in midstream. Philadelphia Willkie Clubs produced a skit in which a bell was tolled 164 times indicating 164 years of liberty. Characters portraying Washington, Jefferson, Jackson appeared on

²⁴Theodore Cousens, *Politics and Political Organizations*, 445.

²⁵*ibid.*

the stage and spoke against a third term. Finally Roosevelt appeared and as he spoke Uncle Sam came out and made gestures against him.²⁶ Incidentally, no candidate was ever pelted with as many missles as Willkie. Everything from rotten eggs to stones was hurled at him.

Literature: The most important activity of the independent agencies and, perhaps, the most unfortunate, was the production and distribution of campaign literature. It not only surpassed any other campaign, but it also reached a new low for obscenity and scurrility. However, before analyzing its content one should exonerate the official party literature which for a few exceptions confined itself to the bounds of decency, if not within the bounds of good logic. The notable exception on the part of the Democratic party was a pamphlet issued by the Colored Division of the Democratic National Committee in which Willkie's political ascendancy was likened to that of Hitler, and his father was accused of taking a leading part in the anti-negro activities in Elwood, Indiana. Furthermore, it stated that Willkie's background was German, inferring at the same time that he was pro-German. Chairman Flynn of the Democratic National Committee repudiated the pamphlet two days later, and apologized to Mr. Willkie.²⁷

Part of the investigation of the Gillette Committee was devoted to a scrutiny of the campaign literature of 1940. In answer to its nation-wide request for samples of literature, the committee received over 400 pieces, one-third of which were anonymous authorship, one-half anonymous or unidentified and one-fifth sponsored by some organization or group.²⁸ The Gillette Committee reported that "it is not an exaggeration to state that two-thirds of the 1940 campaign material, exclusive of that issued by regular organizations, was placed in circulation by unidentified individuals or persons."²⁹ Moreover, 82% of the literature came from fifteen pivotal states containing 50% of the vote.³⁰

²⁶*Life*, 4 Nov. 1940.

²⁷Bone, *op. cit.* 9.

²⁸Gillette Committee Report, 4.

²⁹*ibid.* 15.

³⁰*ibid.*

Prejudices: Few political campaigns have been free from religious intolerance and prejudice. This one was no exception. Mention already has been made of the attack on Willkie's ancestry. Early in September the *Christian Century*, which had endorsed Mr. Willkie, printed a quotation from the Jesuit weekly, *America*, which said, "Thus far it has been noted that there is scarcely a well known Catholic in public life who has been accepted in the Willkie political family. . . . It is not unlikely that Mr. Willkie may also avail himself of Catholic wisdom." Previously, the Jesuit paper had commended Mr. Roosevelt for seeking advice from Catholics who were specialists in the fields of economics and social problems. "This looks unpleasantly like the first turn of the screw," concluded the *Christian Century*.³¹

In general, the press was reluctant to discuss the religious question. Unfortunately, it was inserted into a whispering campaign about which this paper will comment later. Numerous examples of intolerance and appeal to race and religious prejudice will be shown in the analysis of the campaign literature which follows. Most people are familiar with the attempt to associate the name of Roosevelt with Jewish origin declaring that it really was Rosenveld.

Political Strategy: The political strategy of the two candidates was not new. Roosevelt, claiming that stress of government business demanded his time, stayed at home while his opponent attempted to set a new travel record for presidential candidates. Turner Catledge, New York *Times* correspondent in Washington commented, "Thus the candidate Roosevelt employs one of the most effective stratagems in American campaigning . . . It is the same tactic used successfully by Coolidge, Wilson, McKinley and others. In fact, the art of dramatizing himself in the job . . . he is lying low in hope that his opponent will run himself to exhaustion around an open trace."³² Then, too, the president was able to use his official position to aid his cause. His "tours of inspections" were assailed by the Republicans. One Republican made a check of one tour. He concluded that the president spent only twenty minutes of the two hour tour inspecting the indicated place.

³¹11 Sept. 1940, 1102.

³²New York *Times Magazine*, 22 Sept. 1940, 9.

Occasionally, Roosevelt would make a non-political address in some focal spot such as New York or Philadelphia. On Columbus Day he addressed a celebration in New York City sponsored by the Italians of that city. Mayor LaGuardia made a short talk which was described in this fashion by a *New York Times* reporter, "After declaring that there was no social fifth column among the people of Italian origin, the Mayor commended the President's leadership and forecast his reelection. As if by pre-arrangement ten or twelve men from Democratic clubs raised campaign posters with President Roosevelt's portrait, and the crowd cheered." The president seemed to possess all the advantages in this campaign.

Polls: A word should be said about polls. Students of public opinion are not in agreement on the charge that polls influence the voter by causing the "bandwagon technique" to work. Everybody wants to be on the winning team, so the voter jumps to that side which is ahead on the closing day of campaign. Raymond Moley was so incensed at polls that he gave a new meaning to the expression "poll cat." "My designation of poll cats has to do with quite different people. They are those faint hearted creatures whose chief desire is to get on the winning side. Poll cats beget poll cats."³³ The Republican National Committee apparently believed that polls might influence voting behavior for it put its approval on the Dunn Survey which predicted that Willkie would win by a minimum of 334 electoral votes.³⁴

It is evident that the independent political committee through the medium of buttons, literature, polls, advertising, exhibitions, and rallies played a large role in the election of 1940. To what degree these activities influence the voter is a matter of conjecture. Perhaps, regional studies at some future time will determine this. It will be of interest to both the historian and the political scientist to note whether the independent political committee bursts into full bloom again in the election of 1948. Although it appeared in the election of 1944, it was handicapped considerably by the conditions of war which prohibited many of its former activities.

³³*Newsweek*, 11 Oct. 1940.

³⁴*ibid.*, 21 Oct. 1940.

IV. PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES OF THE INDEPENDENT POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Definition:

The propagandist in order to get people to act in a desired way will often employ such techniques as:³⁵

1. *Omission*—deliberately ignoring those facts which would damage the case.
2. *Derision*—using caricature and ridicule in order to get people to form opinions without examining the evidence.
3. *Transfer*—using a well known symbol, like the cross or the flag, as authority in order to suggest that they sanction and endorse opinion.
4. *Falsification*—deliberately using untruths, and excessive exaggeration.
5. *Evasion*—using positive symbols like truth, freedom, democracy, Americanism, honor and Christian in order that by identifying one's cause with them opinions will be formed.
6. *Emotional Appeal*—identifying opposing ideas with fears, hates and prejudices so as to create opposition without examining facts.
7. *False Reasoning*—using unwarranted assumptions, begging the question, the rule of the excluded middle, circularity and insufficient evidence.
8. *Association*—use of testimonials, plain folk language, and "the best people read it" approach in order to induce others to think and do likewise.

An analysis on the basis of these techniques is admittedly incomplete. To analyze all the propaganda of the independent committees is not only impossible, but beyond the scope of this paper. Our main purpose is to analyze samples of their propaganda in order to show the degree to which these committees went in order to win votes in the 1940 election. Already several excellent studies have been made on the literature of the campaign. Professor Hugh Bone has made an analysis of some of the Gillette Committee samples of literature in which he reveals the need of federal laws to prevent a future deluge of vicious and scurrilous literature.³⁶ Professor Theodore Cousens in his book on political organizations classifies 92 pieces of campaign literature according to subject.³⁷ Few, if any, studies have been made on the propaganda techniques used in 1940.

³⁵It should be remembered that an appeal to one's reasoning powers is the laudable way of winning support. Unfortunately, an individual is a bundle of conflicts in which reason and emotions are often at odds.

³⁶Bone, *op. cit.*

³⁷Cousens, *op. cit.* 430-437.

BUTTONS:

How many different buttons were used in the 1940 campaign is not known. A survey of 27 of them, however, revealed that only four favored Roosevelt.³⁸ Most of them used the techniques of *derision* and *emotional appeal*. None of them could be classed as scurrilous or vicious. Such slogans as "We Don't Want Eleanor Either" and "Eleanor, No Soap" are good examples of *derision*.³⁹ The negative symbols in the slogans "No Royal Family" and "No Crown For Franklin" suggest at once emotional appeal. Most of these buttons serve to satisfy one's desire for prestige and attention. They offered what Professor Peter Odegard would call "a rationalization of one's visceral hungers."

ADVERTISING:

Several independent committees paid for large advertisements in newspapers. A unique one was used by the owner and editor of a small county newspaper in Mississippi. In his weekly column on the front page he stated that "pages 2 and 3 contain the sensible things that have been done by the Roosevelt administration." The two pages were blank!

The most ambitious and perhaps most costly advertisement of the campaign was that sponsored by the Committee of Regular Republicans For The Reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt. At the top of the full page advertisement were the words "Sorry Mr. Willkie . . . This is where we get off the fence."⁴⁰ The advertisement then presented what it deemed to be ten examples of contradictions made in speeches by Willkie. It pointed out that Willkie in a speech at New Haven, October 9, 1940 stated that "The Republican party is an enemy of monopoly" while in *Fortune*, April, 1940 he asserted that the "Republicans started the trend towards concentration of power." At Philadelphia on

³⁸One of the 27 buttons was the famous salesmen's button. It carried the title "Our Next President" over the pictures of Roosevelt and Willkie. Below them were the words, "The Salesman's Safety Pin."

³⁹The collection of jokes and stories about Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt would make a large one as well as an indecent one. Few first ladies of the land have been subjected to such an ill-assortment of stories and jokes as she.

⁴⁰*New York Times*, 26 Sept. 1940.

October 4, 1940 Willkie was quoted as saying "Attack is closer than ever." At New York four days later he was quoted saying ". . . the United States is not in danger of immediate attack." Similar examples were given by the committee which then concludes that Mr. Willkie is either hopelessly confused or he is deliberately insincere. Among the prominent people named in the advertisement were Chase Mellen, Mrs. Phyllis Baldwin Warburg, Dorothy Thompson, Robert E. Sherwood and former Mayor LaGuardia.

Now the charges against Mr. Willkie may have been true, but truth can not be ascertained by merely comparing quotations picked at random from speeches. This method of attack is quite common among propagandists. Denied the context of the speech, the reader has the choice of either accepting them as truth or seeking the speeches from which the quotations were taken. Here one sees the use of the technique of omission. Moreover, the conclusion which the committee made, namely, that Willkie was either deliberately insincere or hopelessly confused, suggests an *unwarranted assumption*. It was the application of the old rule of the excluded middle which allows no middle ground to be accepted, but applies only the extremes. The use of names of prominent people was the application of the technique of *association*. Incidentally, this same committee disseminated widely a pamphlet written by Mayor LaGuardia entitled "Willkie Vs Willkie" in which the same type of attack was made using quotations as its basis. Readers were asked to send in money contributions!

Not to be outdone, the Willkie Magazine Fund inserted a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times Magazine* in which it heralded this election as a crusade.⁴¹ The reader was given a questionnaire in which spaces were placed so that he could determine his political acumen. By adding up the checks in the column he could ascertain his political camp. The reader was requested to send his score sheet to the Willkie Magazine Fund. In addi-

⁴¹Sept. 15, 13

tion, he was asked to aid the cause by sending \$2.00 or more to the committee. The following fourteen questions were submitted to the reader:

1. F. D. R. is or is not indispensable?
2. F. D. R. has or has not been frank with the public on National Defense?
3. Delay in National Defense is or is not due to bungling?
4. Should the United States be put in war before we have adequate planes and guns?
5. Should presidents have 3rd, 4th, and 5th terms?
6. A president should or should not live up to his promises?
7. The New Deal has or has not a workable plan for recovery?
8. There are or there are not ten million unemployed?
9. Cost of recovery has or has not been 22 billions?
10. Are those billions to be paid?
11. Is or is not F. D. R. running for office?
12. Should candidate Roosevelt face candidate Willkie in debate?
13. Does F. D. R. have time to dedicate parks and dams?
14. Do we need a business executive to manage the world's largest business problems, Recovery and National Defense?

Some questions are indisputable. The cost of recovery as well as the number of unemployed were a matter of record. However, most of the others were loaded with inference and unwarranted assumptions. No one denies that a president should live up to his promises! The inference, of course, was that Roosevelt has not done so. Likewise in question fourteen there was the inference that Roosevelt was not a business executive. Then, too, the rule of the excluded middle was used. The choice was one of the extremes. Either one admitted that delay in National Defense had been caused by bungling or he denied it. Most of these questions are products of the technique of *False reasoning and omission*.

BILLBOARDS:

Life magazine on Nov. 4, 1940 carried a picture of a number of political billboards picked at random throughout the United States. Most of them were identified as the work of independent committees. The Willkie Clubs of America displayed a large sign in which a small girl was shown pulling the trouser of her Dad. Printed above the two were the words "Daddy, what's democracy?" Below was the answer, "It's America with Willkie." Another poster, whose origin was not given, carried in large print the words, "Save Your Church! Dictators Hate Religion!"

A third had a picture of the Statue of Liberty on one side. To its right were the words, "Don't Tear Down the Statue of Liberty. Refuse Dictatorship." A fourth billboard was placed above an advertisement of the Charlie Chaplin motion picture "The Great Dictator." It read "We Want Willkie. Third Term Means Dictatorship."

Not all of the billboards were for Willkie. The Democratic National Committee sponsored one which read, "Roosevelt's Way is the American Way." Another poster sponsored by some local group had a picture of Roosevelt superimposed on a map of the United States with the words "America Needs Roosevelt."

Some of the other billboard signs read as follows:

1. Hitler was Elected the First Three Times.
2. Let's Go To Work With Willkie.
3. It's Not Big Business we fear . . . It's Big Business.
4. Arms for defense, sure! But what about American enterprise and unity. Let's be sure to keep America to Defend.
5. I'm For Him (Picture of smiling laborer accompanied picture of Willkie).

One can readily see that some of these appealed to reason. The propagandist does not always deem his audience devoid of intelligence. But he prefers to use those techniques that move large masses of people to accept his opinions. Such words as dictator, democracy, American Way and American Enterprise are weasel words whose meanings are not at all the same to everyone. They are, however, symbols or mental stereotypes which suggest either good or bad. Sing them to the heavens and the audience will sing them with you. Their use illustrates the techniques of *evasion* and *emotional appeal*. One certain method of arousing a group for action is to assert that their church is jeopardized. Likewise, most people are convinced that they want the American Way, although they are less certain what it means. So, in these billboard advertisements such symbols were used. The Statue of Liberty symbol was used to transfer the impression that it was in danger. The word, dictator, a negative symbol, was used with abandon for its connotations were many.

Literature of the Independent Committees:

The most active, and by far, the most productive of the independent committees was the Associated Willkie Clubs of America. Their literature was distributed over the entire country. It included the following items:

1. *We Want Willkie*—a small pamphlet which listed the reasons why Willkie should be elected. Professor Cousens describes this as the most effective piece of literature used in the campaign.⁴²
2. *No Third Term*—card.
3. *Vital Issues*—a small folder containing instructions to speakers of the Willkie Clubs.
4. *Wendell Willkie's Petition*—a four page pamphlet with the picture of Willkie on the front. A resume of his life was presented along with a statement of his principles.
5. *Wendell L. Willkie—The Story of A Country Boy Who Made Good and Why The Republican Convention Nominated Him for President of the United States*—a history of Willkie's life in 12 cartoons.
6. *America We're For You*—a song by Amy Wall and Rose Russell Clark.
7. *The Third Term—Why Not?*—a pamphlet giving reasons for opposing a third term.
8. *Think*—a card containing five questions.
9. *Who Is Wendell Willkie*—a four page folder giving biographical sketch as well as illustrations of what he has done. Contains statements of his platform, and several endorsements from people in all walks of life.
10. *We'll Win With Willkie*—a windshield sticker.

Most of this literature attempted to present the ideas of Wendell Willkie. Moreover, the appeal in most of them was one's reasoning power. There is no remedy for clear thinking. It needs none. However, the authors of this literature were aware of the value of the techniques of *transfer* and *association*. In the pamphlet *Wendell Willkie's Petition* there was the slogan "To work for Willie is to express your Americanism." In the pamphlet *Who is Wendell Willkie* the Republican candidate was described as a "true humanitarian workingman." This same pamphlet used the technique of *transfer* when it stated that Willkie stood for such symbols as individual liberty, adequate defense, America, the land of opportunity, work, sacrifice and achievement. Who didn't! *Emotional appeal* was also used when Willkie was portrayed as being opposed to war, Hitlerism, intolerance, and irresponsible reforms. The last page of this same pamphlet recognized the value of the *testimonial* device. State-

⁴²op. cit. 430.

ments of support by people ranging from a salesgirl in a Ligget store to the President of Yale University were presented.

The song entitled "America We're For You" emphasized such words as freedom, prosperity, liberty and democracy. Its words were:

America-America
Let's put Willkie in the President's Chair
With all his might
He'll do what's right
And keep us from despair.
Come wake up America
And let freedom ring
For prosperity—for liberty
And democracy—
Let our voices ring out loud and true
Wendell Willkie—We're for you!

The cartoon history of Willkie contained 12 cartoons of various phases of his life. The technique of *association* was used in most of them. He was described as a "country boy who made good." The last cartoon showed Uncle Sam reading a newspaper which had the headlines "Willkie compels T. V. A. to pay 32 million dollars more than they offered for . . ."

The little 15 page booklet entitled, "*The Third Term . . . Why Not?*" written by William H. Bancroft and Anderson Hewitt used an entirely new approach. By inference, it was willing to grant that Roosevelt was a good president, basing its opposition only on the third term. A story was told about an imaginary president John Rogers who "was born in a time when every American boy had a chance to become president." John Rogers served two terms in excellent style being described as the greatest president the United States ever had. He was elected unwisely to a third term resulting in a benevolent "one-man government." John was drafted for a fourth term for no one would let him quit. Moreover, no one else had his experience and knowledge. Two years after his fourth term began, John Rogers died. His successor, Edgar Cork, was a mediocre individual who took advantage of the many powers which John Rogers had secured, and by means of them made himself dictator. By use of analogy and appeal to the fear of dictatorship the booklet cleverly revealed the anti-third term argument. One can conjecture whether

the authors ever dreamed that part of their story would come true!

The best example of the use of the technique of *false reasoning* in the Willkie Club literature was a card entitled "Think." Through inference and analogy it put Roosevelt in a class with the dictators of the world.

THINK

Who nominated Hitler?—Hitler
Who nominated Stalin?—Stalin
Who nominated Roosevelt?—Roosevelt
Who nominated Willkie?—We the People

Indeed, the charge that *falsification* was used could be made in light of the last two statements.

The amount of campaign literature distributed by individuals was quite large. Horace W. Davis of Pittsfield, Mass., reprinted a humorous sketch by Don Herold entitled "Why I Want Willkie." No one will deny its humor. Mr. Harold wrote: I want Willkie for President because:

"He looks to me like a swell two-way escape from Paper Doll Cutters of the New Deal and the Old Mother Hubbards of the Republican Party. He can add and subtract . . . I think Mr. Roosevelt has given us eight years of charming bedside manner (I think he will go down in history as the Great Enunciator)—but I question his medicine . . . I do not like the company Mr. Roosevelt keeps—neither the dillentante hobby-horse economists at his elbow in Washington nor the corrupt political machines with which he buddies in many cities and states . . .

In America we want nothing which has even the faintest odor of automatic, self-renewing dictatorship. Wendell Willkie will not only run the United States with horse sense, but he will give us the greatest show on earth while he's doing it.

I've known Wendell Willkie for twenty-five years and he's always had a circus when puncturing bunk, slicing red tape, and de-glittering glittering generalities."

This type of campaign literature is more important for what it fails to say than for what it says. The paucity of facts has been covered by use of ridicule and ambiguous words. The author resorted to use of *derision* and *evasion* in his effort to win supporters for Mr. Willkie.

The most widely circulated card in the 1940 campaign was one bearing the picture of moronic-looking individual who smiling said, "Sure—I'M for Roosevelt." Most of these cards were distributed anonymously through the mails. On the back of some

of them were these words. "If you are opposed to the Third Term send these to your friends. 15 cards for twenty-five cents. Send coins or stamps. Low, quantity prices on request. Send to Bob Howdale, Box 625, Oak Park, Illinois." The propaganda techniques of the card were, of course, that of *derision* and *False reasoning*. Not only did it produce a laugh at the expense of the New Deal, but it implied that people of low mental capacity supported Roosevelt.

Mr. Earnest Goerner of Milwaukee, Wisconsin printed and distributed a rather scurrilous piece of literature which showed Roosevelt standing behind the bars of a cell. He was shouting, "Third Term Hell! . . . I'm in for Life!!" It represented the use of *derision* at its worst. Moreover, its blatancy and coarseness approached the border of indecency.

A group of Clevelanders sponsored on WHK a radio program which featured, according to them, "the greatest sensation in the Buckeye State's radio history." This sensation was Andy Kelley whose phenomenal rise to fame was matched by his equally phenomenal descent from it. He was billed as "America's Horse Sense Philosopher, A Second Lincoln, A Second Will Rogers." His talks were described as "simple, honest talks to the people, for the people and by one of the people." The use of the techniques of *association*, *transfer* and even falsification were easily evident in this literature.

From the *Wallace Miner*, a weekly newspaper of Wallace, Idaho came a mimeographed sheet entitled "Hoover's Mistakes." No indication was given as to who distributed it. The paper facetiously accused Hoover of being a failure because he failed to do the things which the Roosevelt family had done. Hoover failed because he

"did not preach and promote class hatred and he did not try to pack the Supreme Court . . . He did not ask Congress to assess the taxpayer a billion dollars every time someone shot off a firecracker in Europe and he did not go on fishing trips on government warships accompanied by a fleet of destroyers . . . Mrs. Hoover never made speeches or raced hither and yon on unimportant matters. She never wrote silly drivel on her everyday life . . . She never invited Communist youth to the White House as her guests."

The Wallace Miner was content to throw accusations and insinuations with abandon at the Roosevelt family. Many of the statements simply were untrue. Then, too, only the damaging things were mentioned, a technique of *omission* so often used.

A large folder entitled "A Veteran Speaks" was issued by the Willkie Veteran's National Committee. This folder contrasted the war records of the two candidates, and reprinted a rather vicious cartoon from a Chicago newspaper entitled "Theodore Roosevelt and His Sons." The main purpose was to laud Willkie's contributions to veterans, and to deride Franklin Roosevelt and his sons by showing what Theodore Roosevelt's boys had done. Later the folder was revised slightly and distributed by the Republican National Committee. The techniques used were *derision* and *falsification*. The vindication of the sons of Franklin Roosevelt has now been admitted. Their war records would compare favorably with those of Teddie's sons, if not surpass them.

The temper and tone of the literature of Democratic independent committees was far less bitter than that of the rival party. At least fifteen pieces of literature were printed by the Government Printing Office and distributed through a congressman's franking privilege.⁴³ These consisted largely of speeches delivered on the floor of Congress. The most vitriolic and vociferous speaker of the Democratic party seemed to be Harold Ickes. Two of his speeches, "All This and Heaven Too" and "That Third Term Bugaboo" were distributed anonymously. They abound in the techniques of *evasion* and *derision*.

A flyer entitled "The Great God Buddha Speaks To The Four Winds" was distributed by county committees. It pointed out the inconsistencies of Willkie, using the same ideas as those presented in the advertisement of the Regular Republicans for Roosevelt.⁴⁴

The most scurrilous literature of the campaign of 1940 was that issued by anonymous persons or committees. It already has been pointed out that one-half of all the literature collected

⁴³Cousens, *op. cit.* 430 *et passim*.

⁴⁴Supra, 21 and 22.

by the Gillette committee was anonymous or unidentified. Much of it appealed to personal dislikes, racial and religious bias, and the threat to one's security. Almost every technique of the propagandist was employed.

One anonymous piece was a flyer with the word "Inspected" across the top. Below were the words "This place has been inspected for and found free of third termites." Another example was a two inch square piece of paper entitled "How the Score Stands." One side read "I Am Not The Indispensable Man" underneath which were the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Cleveland and Wilson. On the other side were the two words "I Am," below which was the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Both of these items indicated the use of the techniques of *association and false reasoning*. Termites obviously are undesirable guests! In the matter of indispensability, one begs the question in assuming that Roosevelt considered himself indispensable.

A common type of literature was one which used the techniques of *derision* by definition. Entitled "Washington Definitions," a leaflet proceeded to define such words as coordinator, conference, professor, economist, and consultant. The professor was defined as "a man whose job it is to tell students how to solve the problems of life which he himself has tried to avoid by becoming a professor. The economist was defined as a "man who had a Phi Beta Kappa key on one end of his watch chain and no watch on the other."

Poetry came into its share in the 1940 campaign. Most famous was the poem entitled "Traitors Three," consisting of twelve verses of ridicule and scorn. An idea of its content can be gathered from the first and last verses.⁴⁵

TRAITORS THREE

Brutus and Arnold and Franklin D.
Sat in the shade of an old apple tree.
Their conversation took a turn
As to which was the most traitorous worm.

* * *

Brutus stood there all filled with awe
And Arnold sat with a falling jaw.
Then Brutus said, "We've had our fling!
Get up there Arnold, salute your King!"

⁴⁵Bone, *op. cit.*, 32.

A parody on the 37th Psalm was inserted into the campaign. *Derision* was its object as one can gather from these lines:

1937 PSALM

Roosevelt is my shepherd
 I live in want.
 He maketh me to lie down on park benches,
 He leadeth me past still factories,
 He disturbeth my soul.
 He crooneth me into paths of destruction for his party's sake.
 Yea, tho I walk thru the shadow of Depression
 I anticipate no recovery, for he is with me,
 His policies and diplomacies they bewilder me,
 He prepareth a reduction in my salary,
 He annointeth my small income with taxes,
 My expenses runneth over.
 Surely unemployment and poverty shall follow me all the days of my life
 And I shall dwell in a mortgaged house forever.

Anti-Semitism, long a tool of the propagandist who appeals to racial hates, was printed in a short poem which read:

O haven't you heard the news?
 We're at war to save the Jews
 For a hundred years they pressed our pants
 Now we must die for them in France
 So we sing these Doughboy blues

It's a hellova fate to choose
 To die to save the Jews
 But the New Deal busted and left us flat
 So this war was hatched by the Democrats
 To end our New Deal Blues.

A phonograph record distributed by an organization which called itself the "I Wanna Be A Captain Club" attacked the Roosevelt family. It started out with the lines:

A Captains bars are burnished
 And they glitter in the sun
 Their wearers are the wise ones
 Who have all their errands run.
 I haven't passed the courses
 I haven't done squads right
 But I guess I'd be a Captain
 If my dad had so much might.

Another weapon which was given wide distribution was "Seven Long Years." It read:

SEVEN LONG YEARS

Republicans for seven long years
Have shed their coats and skins and tears
To tell their comrades how they feel
Regarding Roosevelt's New Deal

For Seven long years they've played for votes
But never mentioned six cent oats
They say this New Deal stuff is rotten
But never speak of five cent cotton.

For Seven long years they've wept aloud
And cussed this money spending crowd
They say of liberty we've been born
But not a breath of eight cent corn.

Using the techniques of *association* and *derision* anonymous parties disseminated a parody on the allegiance to the flag.

I hereby pledge my allegiance to the Democratic party and to the Roosevelt family for which it stands: One family indispensable, with divorces for all.

The most vicious aspect of the 1940 election was the whispering campaign which preceded it. Willkie was accused of being pro-German, of buying the delegates to the Republican convention in Philadelphia, and of being anti-Catholic. Far worse were the accusations against Roosevelt. He was called a madman whose physical weakness was caused by insanity. He was not living with his wife, and intended to seek a divorce as soon as he was re-elected. He was of Jewish ancestry, and had become a tool of the Pope. Such were the insidious charges made. The types of jokes and stories about the Roosevelts went beyond all bounds of decency.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In almost every piece of anonymous literature, an attempt was made to resort to derisive tactics. Personal abuse and exaggeration combined to create a negative symbol out of the Roosevelt family. What to some might have appeared as sheer nonsense was accepted as fact by a docile public. The writer recalls a survey which he made among senior high school students in 1940. They were given six rumors about the Roosevelt family, and asked to mark the ones which they believed. Only 10%

were unwilling to believe all of the rumors. It is extremely doubtful whether one could ascertain the effect of this anonymous literature. It reflects a spirit of ugliness and disdain for rules of accepted behavior. The historian can compare future elections with this one, and determine whether its scurrility was a product of emotional release, or a trend in American politics.

Shortly after the election William Allen White, editor of the *Emporia Gazette* urged that public bonfires be made of all the Democratic and Republican campaign buttons and literature. This should be done, Mr. White said, "not in the spirit of exultation on the part of the victorious party, but with the idea that we destroy the symbols of partisan bitterness and unite now on a national program of safeguarding American democracy."⁴⁶ *Commonweal*, the Catholic weekly, referring to the campaign commented that "it was a bitter and dirty campaign."⁴⁷ James Farley stated, "I am sorry that an excessive note of bitterness and harshness has crept into the campaign just closed."

Perhaps, the sanest approach to the issues of the campaign was made in the editorial of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* which endorsed Roosevelt. On Oct. 13, 1940 the editorial stated, "The third term issue coupled with the frequent evidences Mr. Roosevelt has given of dictatorial tendencies gives us pause. We are opposed to the third term, to be perfectly candid. It is an opposition based upon fear more than reason. Fear says, Beware! Reason says that it is a question for the people to decide in the most democratic of all processes—the process of the ballot box."⁴⁸ Yet, in much of the propaganda of the 1940 campaign reason had a back seat!

The conclusions to this study are as follows:

1. The Hatch Act of 1940 did not effectively curb the expenditures of the major political parties which employed several methods of circumventing it.
2. One of the main features of the campaign of 1940 was the growth of a multiplicity of independent political committees most of which supported Willkie.

⁴⁶*Scholastic*, 11 Nov. 1940.

⁴⁷15 Nov. 1940.

⁴⁸*ibid.*

3. These independent committees spent millions of dollars for literature, buttons, advertisements, and stunts, but only 5% of them reported expenditures as required by law.
4. No attempt was made by the national committees of either major party to discourage these activities.
5. No presidential campaign ever cost as much or saw as much scurrilous literature and campaign devices as that of 1940.
6. Anonymous and non-party literature greatly exceeded party literature.⁴⁹
7. The Willkie material far exceeded that for Roosevelt.
8. The activities of the independent political committees used every technique of propaganda in their attempts to influence opinion.

⁴⁹Anonymous political advertisements and literature are now banned by a law passed by Congress in 1944. A fine of not more than \$1000.00 or one year in jail, or both, may be imposed for violation of this law.

Who Wants to Keep 'em Down on the Farm*

DAN R. DAVIS

AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF TEXAS

If the place of agriculture in American life is to be one of respect, dignity, and reasonable opportunity generally, we must solve the problem of too many people on the land by out migration and lowering of the birth rates in underprivileged regions.

Although the long-time trend in the general average of reproduction rates in the United States is downward, many areas have rates considerably higher than the net reproduction rate of 100 which is considered necessary for maintaining a stationary population in our nation.

Differentials in reproduction rates are aligned on the basis of regional differences, rural-urban differences and class differences. The net reproduction rate was 74 for cities, and 144 for rural areas in 1940. This means that the child bearing generation of the rural population is reproducing itself 44% above replacement; the net reproduction rate for the South is much higher than the national rural rate of 144. Cities are 26% deficient in ability to maintain a stationary population. Another approach to the problem is the number of children under five years of age per 1,000 women twenty to forty-four years of age. In the urban population, this number was 310; in the farm population, 648.

The birth rate is materially higher in the rural-farm, than in the urban population in every major geographic region of the United States. In these groups the number of children under five per 1,000 women twenty to forty-four is: in the Southwest, farm 660, urban 345; in the southeastern states, farm 722, urban 314; in the Northeast, farm 561, urban 293; in the middle states, farm 582, urban 323; in the Northwest, farm 615, urban 370; and in the Far West, farm 501, urban 284.

The regional imbalance in burdens of rearing children, providing food, clothing, shelter, education, and affording health facilities is reflected when we select a few states from several regions and indicate the ratio of children (5-17 years of age) per 1,000

*Statistics from U.S. census of 1940.

adult productive workers as follows: South Carolina 587, Ohio 346, New Mexico 563, Mass. 339, N. C. 555, Ill. 315, Ala. 540, N. Y. 301, Utah 516, and California 277. In the cotton states more than 8 children are enrolled in school for every \$1,000 state tax revenue; in the other 38 states only 4 children are enrolled.

The states with large rural populations and high birth rates in the South afford the cheap labor reserve for the industrial North and East which was formerly provided by Europe. We are recruiting our population from the underprivileged rural classes and primarily from the southern region of lowest per-capita income, poorest school systems, lowest plane of living, poorest housing, library, and health facilities, and from the region that expends greatest economic effort for education. The 10 cotton states which have 42.6% of the farm population of the United States and only 24.8% of the farm income spend 25% of state income for education. The other 38 states spend only 16%.

Agriculture, in spite of a temporary "feed the world policy," faces a long term decline in opportunities for agricultural employment, and youth must be prepared to migrate out of the southern agricultural region or suffer the inequalities caused by population pressure. With the perfection of the cotton picker and flame-cultivation devices, and further adaptation of tractors and other tractor equipment the mechanization of agriculture is taking new strides. There has been also a gradual decline in agricultural exports. The rapid increase in population in recent decades which has produced an expanding market has not resulted in increased employment opportunities in agriculture, because of the even greater increase in production efficiency. Between 1870 and 1930, output per farm worker increased about 150 per cent but farmers have benefitted relatively less than other groups from this increase in efficiency. During the period 1910-14, farm population amounted to 34 per cent of the national total, and farmers received 17 per cent of the national income. Twenty years later they constituted 25 per cent of the population and received only 9 per cent of the total income.

Increased purchasing power of the urban population will not provide demand for additional farmers, since the increase in purchasing power of urbanites will be primarily the result of

increased technology, and technological advance in agriculture means greater production by a smaller number of farmers. Limitations in demand for farm products are much greater than for the increasing varieties of industrial goods and services.

The decline in occupational opportunities in farming was indicated in the 1930's, when the number of youths in many rural areas becoming 18 years of age were more than twice as great as the number of vacancies being made for them by the death or retirement of farm owners.

Few people realize the extent to which we could reduce the present number of farmers without substantially reducing agricultural production. The census of 1940 shows that one half of the farmers sold less than 10% of all farm products sold or traded in the U.S. and the other half of the farmers sold the remaining 90%.

In the past, rural youth found job opportunities in an expanding frontier with abundance of free land; later, youth found jobs in the rapidly growing cities, buoyed by an expanding economy common to a rapidly expanding population. However, by 1940 trends of the expanding economy and expanding population had greatly diminished; a more rigid economy had developed and most job opportunities in manufacturing and industry were concentrated in 200 counties. Seventy-five per cent of these counties were north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi rivers; 15% of the job opportunities were in the Southeast, and 5% in the far West. With the closing of temporary war plants it is doubtful that the national distribution of job opportunities has been radically altered. This means that, generally, youth produced in the rural South, the population seed-bed of our nation, must migrate long distances and locate in a strange culture without benefit of a rural school guidance program. Many rural schools are feeble in their attempts to prepare youth for a livelihood in either agriculture or in village life: and they do not prepare youth to work in cities, in industry and commerce.

Next to war, rank those closely allied national and international problems of social, economic, and political nature that stem from population pressures. However, the national

problems that grow out of excessive reproduction rates in some areas and deficient rates in others are not hopeless. As aids to a solution the writer proposes the following:

First—Federal aid for education accompanied by enlightened state or other supervision and direction to insure suitable programs and standards.

Second—The adoption of a national economy of abundance and full employment.

Third—The adoption of a national population policy.

The first suggestion arises from the situation pointed out above. The rural South and other areas now functioning as the principal contributors to a national population reserve are not financially able to carry the burden of properly educating their future citizens for later work in various parts of the nation. Since the school is the principal institution for implementing social mobility (movement from class to class in the social hierarchy), federal aid to schools in underprivileged areas would increase opportunity for social mobility to families of the lower classes who are least adequate to rear large families. Expenditure of federal funds for education should be based on need and distributed without regard for race, creed, or religion.

The second suggestion concerns the adoption of a national economy of abundance and full employment. It took a second World War to prove that we can have full employment, full production and an economy of abundance in the United States. The fantastic development of this nation has often been attributed to "Yankee ingenuity" and "know-how." Yankee egotism has prevented us from granting recognition to "dame nature" for blessing our land with the greatest abundance and variety of natural resources in the world and in the "land of plenty" we have operated under an economy of laissez faire in which three major groups have attempted to get more and more by producing less and less, each of the following has tried to gain higher prices by lowering production: industry, through monopoly; labor, through unions; and farmers, through politics have tried to gain higher prices. An economy of scarcity fosters rigid class distinctions and job opportunities are few.

The third suggestion concerns the adoption of a population policy, the need for which has not yet been recognized by the general public. The writer will not attempt to discuss the funda-

mentals of such a policy in this article. However the objectives should include designs to aid in eliminating the extreme differences in fertility rates between regions, between rural and urban population, and between classes. We have developed a policy for soil conservation and proper land utilization; it is possible to democratically develop a national population policy for the conservation of human resources and the democratic guidance of human energies into channels for maximum social and economic utility. Those least able economically to afford care, education, and health provision have the largest families and those most adequate to rear children have the fewest. The writer has pointed to the possibilities of lowering the high fertility rates among lower classes in underprivileged regions by affording equality of opportunity for social mobility through federal aid to education.

Similar unbalance in fertility differentials is found between economic and educational classes. The net reproduction rate for urban income classes is: \$3,000 and above, net reproduction rate of 42; \$2,000 to \$2,999, net reproduction rate of 63; \$1,500 to \$1,999, net reproduction rate of 68; \$1,000 to \$1,499, net reproduction rate of 75; \$1,000 and less, net reproduction rate of 96. The net reproduction rate for urban educational classes is as follows: College education, net reproduction rate of 52; high school, 68; eighth grade, 86; seventh grade or less, 97. These figures indicate the possibilities of the school as a means for implementing lower fertility rates and social mobility among lower classes.

There is need also for re-orienting the psychological attitude in regard to children in the upper classes who do not assume proper responsibility for perpetuating the race. In the process of developing an urban culture, children and home life have emerged with a rather low value. The American city is built for material production and exchange; not for child production and home life. The individual, not the family, is tending to become the economic unit in cities, and the family is shifting from an institutional basis to that of a companionate function. The urbanites concept of values is centered on "self" and the

perimeter places college degrees, finery of dress, luxuries, social prestige, and "lap dogs" above children.

Thus, the gains made in education tend to be cancelled out by low fertility and the carriers of culture do not reproduce themselves.

Our Relations With Latin America

WILLIAM H. SHOEMAKER

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The importance of our relations with Latin America is today somewhat overshadowed in the national consciousness by our worrisome domestic problems, Russia, The Far East, and perhaps the U.N. But our sense of present and future responsibilities has become greater than ever in the new post-war internationalized world of today, if only because the other members of the Big Five all consider—tacitly at least—that Latin America is within our sphere of influence, as indeed most of the world has thought for a much longer time than we have. Besides this, the problems involved in inter-American relations are older than others and have been under scrutiny for a longer time, and with partial or temporary solutions. While these problems challenge our skill and intelligence, our sincerity and good will at every step, enough experience and success have already been ours to warrant making Pan-Americanism a model for enlargements and a symbol of what international cooperation can be.

“Latin America” will not be found on any map and no one naturally calls himself a Latin American. The unsatisfactory denomination is used in this essay, however, as it is popularly, in preference to Ibero-america(n), which excludes French Haiti, and to Spanish America(n), which is inapplicable also to Portuguese-speaking Brazil, to refer to a vast but well-defined area. This area has no geographical unity or uniformity, no political identity, and no economic unity. But it does exist historically and culturally distinct from Anglo-Saxon America. And by contrast with the latter, Latin America exists psychologically both for us in the United States and for the Latin Americans themselves.

* * * * *

In considering *Our Relations with Latin America*, several facts, however well known or obvious they may be, must be fully realized. One is that the problem is considerably more complex than the problem of our relations with, let us say, Russia. I do

not say "more difficult" but I do say "more complex," and since complexity denies simplicity, our national attention must be able to focus in many different ways on many different spots. In our relations with Russia we deal with the Russian Government—a single agency and one which is not likely to find its commitments rejected by a congress or by the people, nor criticized by the press. In dealing with Latin America, on the other hand, it is a matter of twenty such official governmental relationships—one with Mexico, three with the Caribbean republics, six with Central American nations (including Panama), and ten with the continent of South America. For a variety of reasons many problems are at best not so much simplified as magnified by the number of nations involved. Add to this those areas of the United States itself where the cultural background and language are close to those of the eighteen Spanish-speaking Latin American states.

If we are steadily but surely and thoroughly Americanizing those parts of Florida, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California where the sense of unity with Mexico and the other daughters of Spain was greatest, the same unhappily cannot be said of Puerto Rico, to which the Latin American peoples always look most intently for signs of our intelligence and our good intentions. They look at the results and at the means used to achieve them. To date, they see little to cheer them or to cheer about. Few United States Americans think of Puerto Ricans as fellow-Americans. The island has won in nearly fifty years neither statehood nor independence nor any measure of economic prosperity. We are not proud of our failure in Puerto Rico, but our sentimental regret carries much less weight in Inter-American affairs than do the deplorable conditions themselves which the rest of Latin America views as a product of the dominance of the United States in the island and the replacement merely of Spain's colonial policy by another one of our own. Through our efforts, sanitation and public health measures, combined with the services of medical science, have greatly reduced the death rate; but now the island has a population greater than Kansas, with a density of five hundred persons per square mile as compared with the United States average of forty-one, and the people are starving. Perhaps

the Puerto Rican problem is just one of the many instances over the world in which the lag of the so-called social sciences behind the natural sciences is most glaring. Trained specialists, recognized and respected as such, plus a broadly educated public in the many phases of the life and relations of human beings *as* human beings is indubitably a desideratum second to none; and one may venture to claim—even in these “edgy” days, that such education should take priority, especially with our youth, over specialized scientific training that is *per se* humanly irresponsible.

* * * * *

The twenty Latin American independent republics comprise one tenth of the Earth's surface, nearly all the land surface from our Southern borders to the South Polar ice—i.e. all the North, Central and South American mainland except a small section of Honduras, and the three small Guianas on the Northeast coast of South America. While the British, the French, and the Dutch have island possessions south of our borders, chiefly in the Caribbean, the largest islands—Cuba and Haiti-Santo Domingo—are three of the twenty Latin American republics.

This means that singly, or all together, or in groups, the Latin American nations represent what force or power lies to the south of us; also that no other government but theirs and ours determines political action in this vast area. However, a great deal of influence through economic power lies with Britain, not so much through Canada or her colonial possessions as through her capital investments and huge foreign trade, in which the Latin American countries and the British Isles and some British possessions are mutually and almost perfectly complementary. This trade Britain is now trying needfully, almost desperately, not only to recover but to expand. Other influences in Latin America have been Spanish, French, German and Japanese. The Japanese influence was the newest and, although the Japanese colonist groups still remain chiefly in Brazil and Peru, one can safely say that any influence emanating from the Japanese homeland independent of the present Japanese residents in Latin America has ceased to exist. The German influence has been eclipsed, but the *Vaterland* is greater than Nazidom. Nevertheless, after the present Prussianized military oligarchy is destroyed

in Buenos Aires (unfortunately now, at a quite unpredictable future date), it is doubtful whether any effective German influence directly from Europe will be felt. The French influence, purely cultural and very strong, will undoubtedly return and probably as rapidly as France reestablishes herself as the leader she once and only recently was. The Spanish influence is the greatest—both the best and the worst. Like the Japanese, the German and the French, it is not primarily economic and not directly political. To it I shall return later.

* * * * *

In so far as man is the product of determining factors in his heredity and his environment, a word about these two kinds of factors is appropriate, chiefly because they are radically different from ours, and because an adequate appreciation of differences is always essential to successful inter-human relations.

The physical conditions under which most Latin Americans live are not duplicated in the United States. Uruguay, for example, the smallest of the Latin American countries, is the only one that lies wholly in the temperate zone. Parts of Mexico, Paraguay and Brazil and nearly all of Chile and Argentina lie also in temperate zones, but fourteen of the twenty republics lie wholly in the torrid zone. The equator itself passes through three of them—Brazil, Colombia and its very namesake little Ecuador. United States Americans find the climate of Uruguay, central Chile, southern Brazil, and the northern two thirds of Argentina quite pleasant. But northern Chile is a desert and northern Mexico a semi-desert. In the torrid zone countries so unbearable are the heat and the humidity that United States Americans cannot live in the coastal cities. In the great Amazon valley, still wild and sparsely peopled, few white men can long exist. In any case special concessions must be made to the enervating and exhausting effects of the conditions of life imposed there by Nature herself. Fortunately, most of the Latin American people do not have to live in those parts, for from Mexico through Central America, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru much of the land is raised by the Rockies-Andean range and the several collateral chains. In the great high Latin American cities like Mexico City and Bogotá, for example, temperatures

are never severe, but the rarefied atmosphere does affect stamina and prolonged exertion. We in the United States have no major city at the altitudes of these capitals of Mexico and Colombia or at that of the capital city of La Paz in Bolivia, which is far above the timberline at something over twelve thousand feet. Because of these conditions interior communications and transportation are largely undeveloped and at best will prove very costly. The toughest engineering job yet found in highway construction is said to have been encountered in tiny Costa Rica and is caused by mountainous terrain which cannot be avoided. Agricultural effort is expended on many a hillside which a Kansas farmer would scorn. It is not uncommon to see a Mexican corn planter straddling the contour row with a foot on the down-side and a knee on the up-side. I myself have seen slopes of nearly forty-five degrees under cultivation. In short, climate and the topography in Latin America make for more extreme conditions than prevail here.

The potential wealth of these lands is, however, enormous. The whole area lacks the essentials of heavy industry. But except for this—which is a good thing, if it means the elimination of a war potential—Latin America is largely and could be almost completely self-sustaining, although even before the war it had what is called a favorable balance of trade—i.e., exports exceeded imports. Argentina and Uruguay alone could supply enough wheat and beef for the entire area. From the standpoint of the United States Latin America can become our major source of supply for tin, rubber, quinine—to mention three outstanding critical needs at the beginning of the war—if we refuse to return to dependence on Far East sources. Some subsidizing may be necessary, which could be amply justified on political, if not on economic, grounds. We are all familiar with Cuban cane sugar, with Central American bananas, with Colombian and Brazilian coffee. Hardwoods and tapioca, manganese and copper are less well known. Linseed and the oil extracted therefrom we imported directly and in quantity for the first time at the beginning of the war, when our dependence on middle-man Britain failed. There is indeed an abundance of material products throughout Latin America for exchange in trade with the United States, if we will

but use them. If the cost is greater for some of them than in other markets—especially in the colonial and pseudo-slave labor markets in the Orient—subsidies for political and strategic reasons may well be in order. If Great Britain persists in maintaining an economic empire bloc, it is not unlikely that the United States may favor the formation of one or more Pan-American blocs. We have already greatly aided in the industrialization of several countries in Latin America—for immediate strategic reasons and for the long-term purpose of raising living standards and creating a larger market. It seems incredible that our government would willfully or even willingly allow that market to dry up by cutting off the Latin American sellers' market, by which alone in the long run and after their huge dollar balances which now exist have been depleted, by which alone Latin America could pay for the goods bought from us. The recent increase in capital of the Export-Import Bank and the permission to make loans and guarantees up to three and a half billion dollars, instead of only seven hundred million as formerly, is substantial indication of our government's interest and intentions.

Some persons are of the opinion that United States private investments in Latin America will decrease in amount, now that controls and restrictions of the Latin American governments make foreign development or exploitation less profitable. Nevertheless, Mr. P. H. Dillingham, Foreign Operations Department of the Ford Motor Company, and Mr. Robert H. Patchin, Vice-president of W. R. Grace and Company, do not think so. In a private letter Mr. Dillingham writes that it is the opinion of the Company and of the Managers of the Branches and Associated Companies, through which Ford operates in Latin America, that "our business will expand after Government controls, etc. are relaxed." (He is referring to war-time controls of the United States Government.) Mr. Patchin says, "It is likely that there will be more dollar investments from this country and Latin America in the postwar years than in the period of—say, ten years preceding 1939." And again, "Private enterprise has already announced some fairly important new investments in Latin America, as witness the program of oil refineries in Venezuela,

and the purchase by Corning Glass Works of a substantial interest in the Chilean glass industry."

There seems to be some doubt as to the prospect for young men in this country who would seek employment in Latin American countries on account of restrictions fixed by those countries. It may well be that for white-collar jobs that can be done adequately by nationals, they will be favored as employees, since all countries require that a certain percentage of the payroll go to nationals, the average figure being eighty-five-per-cent. Still, I know of no sharp reduction in foreign—i.e., United States—personnel. Furthermore, there is a great need for experts—in scientific and technical lines and in management. The laws of some countries make specific exception from the eighty-five-per-cent rule of such personnel and any other inadequately supplied by nationals. In a word, while legal restrictions exist, their operation to the disadvantage of ambitious and adventurous American youth would seem to be more theoretical than real.

* * * * *

The history of the Latin American countries—especially of the eighteen Spanish-American republics—discloses national heredities that have many things in common with each other and very few in common with ours. Of these eighteen we may recall that they have existed for a little over four centuries—as Spanish colonies for three and as sovereign republics for one. They were regarded—from Columbus, Cortés and Pizarro on—steadily and consistently on the physical-material side, as property of the crown, as was the home-land itself, and spiritually as lambs of God to be brought into and protected by the church. The colonies were nurtured in absolutism both temporally and spiritually. Protection in government and religion encouraged dependence. Hierarchy demanded personal obedience. Today the Latin American republics are Roman Catholic—authoritarian and dogmatic; they are also nominally (and even ideally, in some nations at least) democratic, but often really bossed by a more or less benevolent tyrant or dictator, the survival of colonial absolutism now divorced from the Spanish crown and implemented by the militarism developed in the nineteenth century during the wars of independence. Spanish literature is filled with *indianos*, a

name given to those who emigrated to the Americas and returned home to Spain. In literature at least, there are very few *indianos* who are *poor*; i.e., most of the emigrants never returned even though they had had that intention. These emigrants from Spain formed the creole class in the colonies; they also united with the American natives, who were not obliterated as in the United States, and formed with them the *mestizo* or mixed-blood group, today the predominant racial element in most Latin American countries. Only Uruguay and Argentina are "white" republics, and they are "white" because when the Spaniards came, rather late to this mineral-poor area, few Indians were found.

Spain's economic policy was consistent with her other authoritarian attitudes. Of chief interest now is the fact that no inter-American trade was allowed; each colony could exchange goods only with Spain and only through the ports of Sevilla and Cádiz, so that control was well maintained. Spain's policy thus coincided with Nature's barriers to discourage relations of the colonies among themselves. Since trade was limited and largely "official," only a small and relatively insignificant middle class of merchants and professional men developed. Agriculture, animal husbandry and mining called most men, and little worlds grew up, with the same more or less paternalistic authoritarianism. Although there have been changes, vigorous ones in Mexico, much of this feudal life and attitude still prevails. It accounts also for the great importance of the individual and the personal element in all kinds of relationships.

In education, Mexico City and Lima (Peru) had the first universities in the New World, nearly a hundred years older than Harvard, and on through the years many fine institutions of higher learning have grown to command international respect. But popular education as we know it—free and compulsory schooling of children at public expense—is a very recent thing even in those countries where it exists; and even there it is often more a theory and a hope than a reality. The Church took care of children's education, but it could at best take care of very few children. So, in education, too, Latin American experience is an extension and a continuation of the aristocratic pattern in Spain.

In so far as a people expresses its soul in its arts, we might well

judge that Latin Americans are more child-like, more primitive, than we. The prominence of folk music and dances and of hand skills in pottery, weaving and the like may point in this direction. If so, maturity is at best a doubtful blessing. It has been claimed that a primitive people sings and dances and chants, but it does not analyze or build complex structures. Poetry is still the major literary form of expression throughout Latin America; the novel is almost the creation of the twentieth century; and except for Buenos Aires and Mexico City there is virtually no theater (and hence no literary drama). It is perhaps significant that the Nobel Prize for literature was last year (1945) awarded to Gabriela Mistral, a Chilean poetess, and the first Latin American so honored, while United States winners have been novelists Sinclair Lewis (1930) and Pearl Buck (1938) and dramatist Eugene O'Neill (1936).

All these differences of the Latin American nations, which I have so summarily touched upon, differences from our own historical and present-day experience are fundamental. But with intelligent appreciation and honest effort on both sides, the force of these differences as barriers between peoples can be neutralized. The most formidable and the most fundamental barrier of all is the difference in language, which is simply a problem of work and learning on both sides. Even in this, we are making rapid strides in this country, especially in Spanish; and in the Latin American countries English has become the first foreign language in the schools. Several hundred Latin American young men and women are now in the United States annually—studying in our schools and colleges.

* * * * *

It is no wonder that with the fundamental and determining differences in heredity and environment, plus many others, the course of international relations between the United States and the Latin American countries has been anything but smooth. The reason is not hard to find. Up until the administration of Herbert Hoover, our Federal government repeatedly subjected the other nations to our military power. In the nineteenth century, we were a young nation rapidly expanding territorially westward from the Atlantic Coastal States, and with a vigorous,

adventurous and courageous frontier spirit that was often ruthless and unscrupulous. Our military might lay behind the independence and then the annexation of Texas, the Mexican War itself which followed, and the later territorial acquisition known as the Gadsden Purchase. In the present century that same might was used to protect the property and investment interest of United States individuals and corporations in the Latin American countries. The war with Spain which preceded had little objective justification. With the mysterious sinking of the Maine in Havana harbor as a pretext, we attacked. We were not provoked; we meddled. Economic and political interest was aided by sentimental sympathy for the supposed victims of Spanish tyranny. Similarly, a few years later we encouraged Panama in her desire for separation from Colombia and promptly recognized her independence. The primary motive was of course national interest in the freedom, security and concessions relative to the future Canal. This was a part of the "manifest destiny" of Theodore Roosevelt, Teddy the Rough Rider. Along with it we assumed the "White Man's burden" and, armed with the "big-stick policy," we forced on Cuba the hated Platt Amendment, which gave us the right of intervention in that country's affairs; we took control of customs' collections in Santo Domingo; we forced a peace between warring Central American nations. During Taft's presidency, the term "dollar diplomacy" was coined, a term which was to stick to us nastily for a long while; and we invaded Nicaragua. Wilson gave lip service to ideas for the Western Hemisphere like the doctrine of "self-determination" for Europe, but our marines invaded the island of Haiti and took over the government. Under Harding and Coolidge, more marines were added to the occupying force in Nicaragua, and so-called "bankers' protectorates" were added in Costa Rica and El Salvador to the five already established (Cuba, Panama, Santo Domingo, Nicaragua and Haiti) in what seemed to many a fearful and worried Latin American to be a very real, albeit disavowed, policy of imperialism on our part. Everywhere we insisted on order and tranquility, supporting dictators and suppressing revolutions to get it. The bold champion of the Monroe Doctrine seemed to have acquired predatory habits. We were cordially

hated and feared throughout Latin America as a beast of prey that had bared his fangs, or at least barked, at Europe in the early days, only to reserve the game for itself.

Alongside this almost continuous series of hostile relations between the United States and Latin America, there had, however, been growing, or at least struggling to grow, a movement that was an ideal of George Washington and Henry Clay and of Washington's counterpart in South America, the liberator Simón Bolívar—an ideal that had been implicit at least, and in the beginning, in the Doctrine John Quincy Adams incorporated into Monroe's inaugural address. The movement was, and is, known as Pan-Americanism. Since the founding of the movement in 1826 under Hispanic auspices, about two hundred specific-purpose conferences and congresses have been held. United States leadership began in 1889 under James G. Blaine. The Pan-American Union was established in Washington for continuous operation and work, with representation from all the countries involved and with a regular staff.

The effectiveness of the work of the movement and the Union took a tremendous leap forward and upward with the reversal of our national policy in international and especially inter-American affairs under Franklin Roosevelt. President Hoover had made a good-will trip to various Latin American countries, and under him tentative beginnings of the Roosevelt policy are now discernible. Our governmental protection of what Coolidge had called "the person and property of a citizen" was less vigorous; the marines were withdrawn from Nicaragua and Santo Domingo; and preparations for their withdrawal from Haiti were also made. Nevertheless, it was Roosevelt who in his first inaugural address stated the Good Neighbor Policy—an ideal and a phrase known and repeated the world over, and at last even believed with increasing conviction by Latin Americans, although the well informed know that our country is still well stocked with Teddy Roosevelts, Tafts, Hardings, and Coolidges. Five years before he became president Franklin Roosevelt had written an article in the publication *Foreign Affairs* opposing territorial conquest, arbitrary intervention, and the use of diplomatic pressure to support vested interests. Action in the next four years imple-

mented those ideas. The Platt amendment was abrogated; by treaty, fuller Panamanian sovereignty was recognized; the marines and fiscal agents left Haiti; we gave pledges of non-intervention in the internal affairs of the other American nations even in case of revolution. Our government refused to intervene in Mexico when that government expropriated the oil lands of American petroleum companies, and even defended the Mexican government's right to do so, providing it paid for the confiscated property. Since 1933, fifteen reciprocal trade agreements have been made between the United States and Latin American countries. The Inter-American Conference held at Lima, in 1938, in which former Republican governor and presidential nominee Alf Landon of Kansas joined as a member of the United States delegation, was widely heralded as making a liberal advance over all preceding conferences. But it was the eighth and most recent of the International Conferences of American States that produced the greatest results. It was held in Mexico City in February and March of 1945 and in the historic castle of Chapultepec, which the United States army had assaulted and captured, killing nearly all the Mexican cadets therein, just about a century before (1847). The greatest achievement perhaps of the Mexico City conference was contained in the so-called Act of Chapultepec, which "institutionalized the principle of collective security on a regional scale." The chief proponent of the Act was the Chilean lawyer Alvaro Alvarez. Apparently it was he who successfully persuaded the United States delegation that it was better to adopt this Act as a model for the San Francisco Conference, scheduled for a few months later—in other words, to make a strong affirmation—than to play 'possum, act cautiously but negatively, waiting to see what would happen. The Act completely inter-Americanizes the Monroe Doctrine; it makes multilateral what had formerly been a United States unilateral policy. It makes an act of aggression against any American republic by any other country (i.e., including the United States) the concern of all, calling for collective action against the aggressor.

Less spectacularly, the Mexico City conference resulted also in an agreement, previously opposed by the United States, that political questions should be admissible to consideration by the

Pan American Union. Also, many semi-independent inter-American bureaus, commissions, etc., were coordinated under the Pan American Union.

The Latin-American republics all saw economic uncertainties after the war, and the Economic Charter adopted in Mexico is little more than a statement of fine principles. But Mr. Edward Stettinius, then Secretary of State, said: "The United States intends to propose and support measures for closer cooperation among us in public health, nutrition, food supply, labor, education, science, freedom of information, transportation and in economic development, including industrialization and modernization of agriculture."

The weakest and to many a very dissatisfying attitude on the part of the United States was our refusal "to discuss the question of breaking relations with Spain" -and the encouragement given to Franco by the extension of our hand to Argentina—an act which we later repeated at San Francisco. I myself believe our action was thoroughly consistent with the Inter-American function of the Conference—to which Europe, Spain or any other part—is no party; and with the accepted idea of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any country, even if that country be Argentina. But that this was of great concern to the Latin American delegates reveals how closely and intimately things Spanish are to them and how deeply they feel about them—a factor we have too often blindly minimized. Just as we played our stupid and hypocritical part from 1936 to 1939 in the Spanish War, clinging to Britain's apron strings and the votes of several million misguided Roman Catholics in this country—an error which Sumner Welles himself now regards as the worst in the Roosevelt administration, although he (Welles) has his full share of responsibility in it—just so were we incredibly and dangerously tardy in recognizing Hitlerism in Argentina and elsewhere.

Somewhat parallel to the Pan-American movement there developed a Pan-Hispanic movement, first institutionalized back in the 1890's with the formation of the Ibero-American Union. It appealed naturally and strongly to the community of race and blood, culture and language, religion and even soul of the mother

country and her former colonies—the very things that constitute barriers between Latin America and the United States. But there was nothing aggressively political in the movement. There was some anti-Yankee doctrine, but no effort on Spain's part to regain any sort of political control of any of her former colonies. Many institutions were established and there was a great deal of publishing by poets, historians and intellectuals generally. October 12, our Columbus day, became the "día de la raza" (day of the race). Spaniards genuinely desired to reestablish contact of any fruitful sort with their blood-brothers in the Western Hemisphere—now that the day of hard feelings and recriminations was wholly a thing of the past. By the middle years (1936-37) of the second Spanish republic the sense of unity had grown. But shortly before this another interest began quietly to make capital of Pan-Hispanism. This other interest was Adolph Hitler, who founded in Berlin in 1934 the Ibero-American Institute, with General Wilhelm von Faupel as the director. As a military instructor in Buenos Aires von Faupel had previously trained the Argentinian army, and in 1936 the innocent cultural institute in Berlin established its bridgehead in Spain, to be used later as the transfer point for German-South American materials and personnel. To preserve this open bridgehead is undoubtedly one of the reasons why Hitler did not go through Spain to Gibraltar, thus keeping Spain nominally a neutral country.

It is evident that Pan-Hispanism was a great force for good in Latin America, also that it could be and was perverted to evil and dangerous uses. It is clear now to all that the action or lack of action of the United States in the Spanish War is largely responsible for our later danger both in Europe and in this hemisphere; and that in the future our relations with Latin America will have to be complemented by intelligent relations with Spain, relations that are in harmony with our Inter-American policy and objectives.

* * * * *

From the foregoing it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that our relations with Latin America, although fraught with problems, seem to have a more promising future than do our relations with any other part of the world, even including our recent major

allies. There is no threat of war. A regional United Nations Organization is already operating. Trade can be not only maintained but expanded, although perhaps not spectacularly. We and the Latin Americans have a great deal to learn in order to achieve a thoroughly effective solidarity of mind and spirit, but we have made great progress, especially in recent years. A continuation and amplification of present policies and practices in the years to come may bring, we dare hope, if not the millennium, a satisfying approximation to it in this brave New World of ours.

Theoretical Problems in the Mathematical Presentation of Economic Analysis

KARL H. NIEBYL

Introduction. The subject matter of the study is an investigation into some aspects of the basic assumptions of mathematics with special reference to the use of the latter in economic analysis. We are concerned *not* with mathematics as a specific technique but with it as an aspect of scientific method, the latter being conceived of as having been designed for the purpose of solving real problems.

As regards the treatment of the subject matter: Many writers have complained about the difficulties which people experience in understanding and teaching the mechanics of mathematical symbolism. It seems that this difficulty still touches only the surface of the very real psychological opposition which is encountered when problems of mathematics and the applicability of the latter to particular disciplines are discussed. In connection with psychological space, Lewin said once that "perhaps the idea of an empirical space which is not identical with the physical one runs so much counter to a firmly established metaphysical prejudice, that one should grant some time to become acquainted with it."¹ Investigations into the sociology of knowledge have amply demonstrated that such *metaphysical prejudices* are by no means accidental. However, as this study is not concerned with semantic therapy, all that can be done is to appeal to conscious open-mindedness. As Keynes put it: "The difficulty lies not in the new ideas, but in escaping from the old ones, which ramify of our mind."²

¹Kurt Lewin, *The Conceptual Representation and the Measurement of Psychological Forces*, published as No. 4 of Vol. I of the *Contributions to Psychological Theory*, Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1938, p. 1. for those brought up as most of us have been, into every corner

²John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, London, Macmillan, 1936, p. VIII.

Function of Quantitative Mathematics in Traditional Economic Theory:

Professor Schumpeter once wrote that the first condition "which has to be fulfilled if one wishes to talk about a mathematical discipline" is to "work with concepts of mathematics which can be expressed mathematically and to which numerical quantities can be attributed."³ Schumpeter is of the opinion that "this condition is completely fulfilled in our field . . . (as), labor commodity, time, price, interest, etc., are quantities . . . , (and) number and number symbols can be attributed to these concepts without any difficulties."⁴

More recently, Professor Gustav Cassel has said that "economics must essentially be a quantitative science dealing with quantities and their relations to one another and with conditions of equilibrium between forces that must be conceived quantitatively."⁵ Cassel, however, sees one of the basic difficulties which the quantitative approach engenders: that proof must be offered that the data handled quantitatively are actually measurable. "In fact," he says, "a mathematical treatment of economics has no value, and may easily be quite misleading, if it is not based on a thorough examination of the quantitative nature of the concepts introduced and on the adoption of definite measures for these quantities."⁶

Cassel's attack upon the naive use of quantitative concepts in economic analysis is interesting and gives us the direction, though not the goal of our present inquiry. His criteria upon which definitions should be based are too well-known to be repeated here. There is, however, in all of them one common characteristic which needs some further discussion. In his reduction of the complicated economic reality to first approximate concepts,

³J. Schumpeter, "Über die mathematische Methode der theoretischen Okonomie," *Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft, Sozialpolitik und Verwaltung*, Wien, Vol. 15, p. 33 (The quotations from foreign language references were translated by the present writer.)

⁴*ibid.*

⁵Cf. Gustav Cassel, *On Quantitative Thinking in Economics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1935, p. 1

⁶*I.c.*, p. 2

Cassel contends that these "most elementary conclusions *must have an absolute validity for every conceivable economy.*"⁷

Cassel here demands "absolute validity" the logical justification of which represents the real problem in the application of established mathematics to social and particularly economic events. For instance, in his analysis of the still commonly used economic concept of "period of production" he shows conclusively that "an 'average period of production' can be explained only if we observe that such a concept was required to meet the needs of a very one sided theory of capital which for a long time dominated economic science, and according to which the function of capital is only to enable us to let a certain time elapse between the productive effort and the harvesting of its fruits."⁸ He concludes quite correctly that "the idea of a 'period of production' . . . has its origin in the view of the private business man, but *has no meaning in the social economy.* The private investor may believe that he invests his capital for a certain period and that he can withdraw it after the lapse of that period. But his possibility does not exist for the social economy taken as a whole."⁹

But when Cassel continues that "the total capital of this economy is in principle invested forever,"¹⁰ we find that he again tries to reach 'absolutes' which he previously combatted. If we find in the course of our investigation that Cassel's statement is correct, that concepts in economic theory can be understood only if the point of view for which they were conceived is taken into account, we will feel compelled to use our findings, as Cassel himself has so aptly proposed, *for the whole of economic reality.* The result of such an application could be paraphrased in the following way: First, economic concepts develop out of the problematic of given situations. Second, the economic reality which is under observation and which while under observation causes the formulation of theoretical concepts, is in constant flux. Third, quantitative concepts do not refer to any metaphysical logic, but are conceptual parts of

⁸*l.c.*, p. 21

⁷*ibid.* (italics mine)

⁹*l.c.*, p. 19 (italics mine)

¹⁰*ibid.*

specific theory: they, therefore, refer to a given and *delimitable* period of economic development.¹¹

The valid use of quantitative concepts does not, therefore, depend on their *seemingly* possible applicability to economic reality. Nor does the validity depend upon their logical consistency alone. Quantitative concepts are rather like gears which are of use only within the structure of the machine for which they are made.

The Nature of the Concept of Quantitative Measurement:

Before we can set ourselves the task of determining the basis for the construction of adequate tools for economic analysis, it becomes necessary to inquire more deeply into the nature of the concept of quantitative measurement. As yet, we have only indicated the real problem.

Cournot, in the first chapter of *The Mathematical Principles of the Theory of Wealth*,¹² described painstakingly the economic reality for the analysis of which he uses his mathematical tools. His basis was the belief generally held during that time that society developed from the most simple stages, characterized by "instinctive actions," to the complicated contemporary society in which "the abstract idea of *value in exchange* . . . supposes that the objects to which value is attributed *are in commercial circulation*; *i.e.*, that it is always possible to find means to exchange them for other objects of equal value." This development, in Cournot's opinion, was by no means at its end. "The extension of commerce and the development of commercial facilities tend to bring the actual condition of affairs nearer and nearer to this order of abstract conceptions, *on which alone theoretical calculations can be based*, in the same way as the skillful engineer approaches nearer to theoretical conditions by diminishing friction through polished bearings and accurate gearing."¹³

These few quotations give an excellent idea of the picture which Cournot had of his contemporary society. Theoretical calculations are possible only on the basis of abstract conceptions,

¹¹Cf. Karl H. Niebyl, "The Need for a Concept of Value in Economic Theory," in *Harvard Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February, 1940 pp. 201 ff.

¹²Translated by N. T. Bacon, New York, Macmillan, 1927.

¹³*I.c.*, pp. 8-9. (italics mine).

these abstract conceptions being in turn replicas of smoothly running socio-mechanical processes. Of course, he does not deny the existence of frictions, but he perceives of them in mechanical terms as Barone did not so very long ago.¹⁴ These analogies to mechanical devices were meaningful at the time in which they were made, since not only the process of the increasing mechanization of the method of production provided society with a major problem, but society itself had begun to exhibit the characteristics of a smoothly running machine, at least on the surface as far as the industrial production proper was concerned.¹⁵

This basically mechanistic concept of society is logically carried through in Cournot's system. He says that when an event has "for its first effect the diminution of the mass of values in circulation, we are tempted to suppose that this event conceals the germ of an increase in the general wealth by means of its remote consequences, . . .".¹⁶

This statement reflects social reality insofar as it refers to the specific circumstances of the first half of the nineteenth century. A generalization of this sort which Cassel proposes to extend into the present is, however, inadmissible. Cournot himself realized that his "*abstract idea of wealth or value in exchange*, on which it is founded . . . would doubtless only be an idle speculation, if . . . (it) were too far from corresponding with the actual objects which make up the wealth in the existing social status."¹⁷ It will be not too difficult to show that the socio-economic conditions implied in Cournot's as well as Cassel's statements are at variance with modern economic reality. It is at the same time obvious that from Cournot's point of view, the historical nature of the conditions which lead to his conclusions could have been neglected if it were historically true today as it seemed then that "the influence of a progressive civilization constantly tends to

¹⁴Enrico Barone, *Grundzüge der theoretischen Nationalökonomie*, Ferd. Dümmlers Verlag, Berlin u. Bonn, 1935, pp. 12-13.

¹⁵It was no accident that Descartes, who in his *Géometrie* (1637) introduced algebraic calculability into geometry, used the image of the machine as an analogy for his philosophical system.

¹⁶I.c., p. 14

¹⁷I.c., p. 17 (italics mine)

bring actual and variable relations nearer and nearer to the absolute relation, which we attain to from abstract considerations."¹⁸

It is interesting to follow the use of this "absolute relation" somewhat further in the history of economic doctrines. Léon Walras once pointed out that the difference between his and Cournot's procedure rests on the fact that Cournot "begins with monopoly and ends with unlimited competition," while Walras believed that "it is preferable to depart from unlimited competition as a general case and to end with monopoly as a specific case."¹⁹ While Walras and Hecht²⁰ conceive of this difference as merely one of procedure, both ways leading to the same goal, a difference of a far more fundamental nature can be discovered here. The institutional contents of the concept "monopoly" in the two cases have nothing in common. Cournot, in his example, makes it quite clear that what he is actually discussing under the heading "monopoly" is the *sole proprietor* whose actions are represented in mathematical symbols under the *condition that all other things remain equal*. This, then, is merely the recognition of the case of the individual entrepreneur who can act as he does act and still be right just because at that time the expanding economy gave a phenomenalist verity to his illusion about the causes behind the results of his actions.²¹ Walras perceived of it as a special case, as a friction or jarring, for the explanation of which he has to use the construct "equilibrium" in order to safeguard the perpetuity of his system. The thirty or forty years which lie between the formulation of those two theories were, however, those in which *laissez faire* capitalism began to show the first signs of capitalist monopolies, and even more clearly the institution of absentee ownership in production.

As far as our problem here is concerned, this difference is of great importance. Cournot was perfectly correct in using quantitative concepts for the presentation of the problems of his time

¹⁸*ibid.*

¹⁹Cf. Léon Walras, *Mathematische Theorie der Preisbestimmung der wirtschaftlichen Guter*, translated by L. v. Winterfeld, Stuttgart, 1881, pp. 3-4.

²⁰Hecht, *Cournot und L. Walras, Ein formaler und materialer Vergleich Wirtschaftstheoretischer Arbeitungen*, Heidelberg, 1930, pp. 27ff.

²¹Cournot, *op. cit.*, pp. 56 ff.

inasmuch as the margin of error involved if applied to that reality was negligible, i.e., economic problems arose for industrial society—and obviously not for the withering mercantile economy—and therewith for Cournot only as *quantitative* problems, problems of extension, expansion, and integration, but not as problems of a qualitatively changed or changing economic structure. The use of those concepts by Walras, however, falls into the beginning of an era in which, parallel with the development of neo-classicism, and the marginal-utility and productivity schools, as aspects of an emerged absentee-ownership interest in economic problems, mathematical tools began to be used pragmatically for the direct purposes of special-interest groups, rather than for the discovery of the economic dynamics of society as a whole. The special interest of these groups veiled the increase in the margin of error if applied to the whole of economic society, and actually emphasized the character of this procedure as one of rationalization, i.e., of ideology formation. The reference made above to the change in the economic reality indicates clearly the basis upon which this change in outlook took place.

Schumpeter was one of the first to state the problem which the marginal utility school was facing when attempting to use mathematical concepts. Neglecting entirely that even Cournot never had in mind that "the use of symbols and formulas could only lead to numerical calculations."²² Schumpeter found the solution "surprisingly simple."²³ To him psychological estimates the basis of marginal utility economics, seem to be, at first glance, *non-quantifiable*. However, "the difficulty of measuring such physically inconceivable magnitudes does not hinder us from regarding them as quantities."²⁴

²²Cournot, *op. cit.* p. 3

²³Schumpeter, *op. cit.*, p. 34

²⁴*Ibid.* Schumpeter remarks in a foot-note interestingly enough that "economics, which also in many other respects is anchored in psychology, can be satisfied to take over simply the procedure and to leave its proof to psychology." This sounds modest enough, but becomes meaningless if psychology itself leaves the logical, i.e., Aristotelian, basis here presupposed and begins to develop a new dynamic basis for the procedure of its inquiry. Cf. Kurt Lewin, *The Conceptual Representation and the Measurement of Psychological Forces*, Durham, North Carolina, 1938.

He further maintains that the "external success which . . . a desire is able to produce, offers us a standard of measurement,"²⁵ and goes on to say that we *can assume* (!) theoretically "that the same cause will produce in the same individual always the same value estimate." In consequence, we can construct a *homo oeconomicus* perceived as a "function merely of his economic situation." The comparison of several *homines oeconomici* is also "without objection."

In the course of his argument, Schumpeter makes a statement that "nothing can show more definitely the aptitude of mathematics for those [marginal utility] ideas than that the fundamental concepts of marginal utility correspond to the equally fundamental one of the differential coefficient of the total utility with reference to the existing quantity of the respective goods."²⁶ What Schumpeter means is the correspondence between the fundamental concepts of marginal utility and the *use to which he puts* the device of the differential coefficient. This is first of all a meaningless tautology, and, secondly, this use is possible only because the differential coefficient is constructed on a Euclidean basis.

This is the entirety of the argument which Schumpeter brings forward for his contention that economic concepts are quantitative in nature.

If we are at all interested in giving meaning to concepts used, whether they be economic or mathematical, we shall have to relate them to the concrete problems rising out of a definitely circumscribed economic reality.²⁷ Schumpeter, whom we take here as representative in this respect of a number of economists of

²⁵*ibid.* (my italics)

²⁶*I.c.*, p. 35: "Jevons had already said that economic value can be regarded as a two-dimensional quantity, that is, a product of intensity and time which therefore, geometrically, can be represented by a plane and, analytically, by the integral of the marginal utility function."

²⁷*Cf.* Albert Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, London, Methuen & Co., 1922, p. 2: "The only justification for our concepts and system of concepts is that they serve to represent the complex of our experiences; beyond this they have no legitimacy. I am convinced that the philosophers have had a harmful effect upon the progress of scientific thinking in removing certain fundamental concepts from the domain of empiricism, where they are under our control, to the intangible heights of the *a priori*."

his time²⁸—and this—is more than an intellectual successor to Cournot and Walras. The marginal utility school which began to develop timidly around the middle of the nineteenth century reflected the gradual growth of an absentee owner economy with people interested in the economic process predominantly as income receivers wanting to maximize their income in the process of spending. It has been pointed out elsewhere,²⁹ that it can be said generally that the main problems of a given period furnish the basis for the dominant *theory* at that time as, *e.g.*, the securing of an adequate volume of productive labor for the expanding industrial economy around the turn of the eighteenth century was the foundation for the development of the labor value theory, and the subsequent first problems in allocating the social product began to be expressed in Say's *théorie des débouchés*, and as J. M. Keynes has rediscovered, in Malthus' theoretical contentions, *int. al.* The changes in the second half of the nineteenth century referred to above again lead to a reformulation of economic theory. The marginal utility school with all its later variations in the dealing with the maximization of income began to be formulated on the basis of a more than crude pleasure-pain psychology and consequent price analysis as its cornerstone. In sum: the only causative continuity existing in economics lies in the motion of economic society.

It is the seeming continuity of doctrine which veils the true character of the common procedure of taking over concepts developed in earlier time for use in later analysis. To Schumpeter, it was enough to show that purely surface emotions irrespective of their historical causation may be more or less intense in order to assume that they are capable of quantitative representation. There is no attempt made to analyze the character of the notion "quantity" and whether the frame of reference for this concept continued to exist. While he realized that the character of quantity depended not only on the measurability of an assumedly given particle but also on the relation of different quantities to one another, he perceived these quantities statically, not realizing

²⁸Cf. in this respect: Marshall, Pareto, Bortkiewicz, Altschul, and others.

²⁹Cf., Karl H. Niebyl, "Historijske ismjene u funkeiji izvoza kapitala (Ezej iz dinamичne teorije)" in *Ekonomist*, Zagreb, Juli-August, 1939, Vol. V, No. 7-8.

that changes in their relative positions may be indicative of a change in the character of the *whole* of which the observed "quantities" are not merely *parts* selected and determined by what is supposed to be theoretical analysis. In other words, Schumpeter's insistence upon the relative lesser importance of exact quantitative measurement and his emphasis on the use of mathematics for the establishment and description of existing relationships between quantities does not extricate him or those who work on the same basis from the difficulty, nay contradiction, of wanting to present a moving scene with a static slide-camera. No fundamental departure from the basic assumptions of quantitative theory has been accomplished. Reality has been only removed by one more stage from theoretical perception and analysis.

THE CONCEPT OF CHANGE IN MATHEMATICS, AND THE SOCIAL PROCESS

It was maintained that economic theory changes because of a changing economic reality. It is contended now that the formulation of the analytical tools for the solving of newly developing problems,—*i.e.*, scientific method, and in the particular form of the latter: the science of mathematics—changes in the same way, though less obviously.

The first problem, then, would be to investigate whether the 'received' mathematical doctrine can be restated in such a way as to allow for the meaningfulness of the particular mathematical technique when related properly to the problems for the solution of which they are intended.³⁰ This would remove continuity in mathematics also from the realm of doctrine formation to the

³⁰"It is sometimes remarked that the relation between social and economic forces and the growth of a particular mathematical theory in a given period cannot be proved; that we have to deal with two parallel developments without any causal relationship. If some relation seems to exist, as can hardly be denied in some very obvious cases (*e.g.*, the origin of logarithms), we are asked to take this as an isolated occurrence. Against this objection we can state that causal relationships, even in natural science, can never be proved to a professional skeptic, that even the fact that the sun has warmed the earth for some billions of years does not imply that it will continue to do so tomorrow. But when several examples of connection are exhibited we (nevertheless) have to ask for the causal connections . . .". D. J. Struik, "Concerning Mathematics," in *Science and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 8.

social process of living. The logical as well as knowledge-sociological validity of such investigation has been presented elsewhere.³¹

In the practice of economic analysis the mathematical law most commonly employed is the law of probability. This law was accepted though not formulated during the development of industrial society.³² It states, *int. al.*, that under the assumption of an infinite number of cases,³³ the probability of choice from these cases will be a function of the number of types prevailing within the given infinite number of data.³⁴ The implication in the formulation of this law is that it will always apply when the circumstances assumed exist; though this implication is hardly ever stated in definite terms. On the contrary, it is usually assumed that the general circumstances implied in this law will *always* exist whether with reference to phenomena scientifically observed as 'nature' or in the realm of economics. However, if some of the notions used in the formulation of this law are related to the then existing economic reality, it will be found that, *int. al.*, the contention of infiniteness exists *only in an*

³¹Karl H. Niebyl, "Modern Mathematics and some Problems of Quantity, Quality, and Motion in Economic Analysis," in *Journal of the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 7, No. 1, January 1940, pp. 103-120.

³²e.g., Leslie Ellis, "On the Foundations of the Theory of Probabilities," *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 1843, Vol. VIII and, by the same author, "Remarks on the Fundamental Principles of the Probabilities," *op. cit.*, 1844, Vol. IX.

³³i.e., the probability will be $\frac{1}{n}$ in the case that the number of balls exceeds all limits.

³⁴"La théorie des probabilités a pour objet certains rapports numériques qui predraient des valeurs fixes et complètement déterminées, si l'on pouvait répéter à l'infini les épreuves des mêmes hasards, et qui, pour un nombre fini d'épreuves, oscillent entre des limites d'autant plus resserrées, d'autant plus voisines des valeurs finales, que le nombre des épreuves est plus grand." A. Cournot, "Exposition de la théorie des chances et des probabilités. Paris, 1843.

expanding economic system, and even then only phenomenologically.³⁵

It is contended, therefore, that the theorems underlying mathematical probability do not lend themselves as a basis for presentations of situations in which the major characteristic is that of qualitative change. While it can hardly be maintained that all 'quantitative thinking' in economics is fully characterized by probability theory, the latter has in fact provided the technical tools for practically the entire output of traditional economic analyses.

With regard to its most general and fundamental implications, this problem of expressing dynamic situations by static means was dealt with and found unsolvable by Russell and Whitehead in their *Principia Mathematica*. And we need mention only in passing that the last proposals in this direction by the late Mr. Keynes—namely of narrowing the scope of a particular analysis to a field in which the rate of motion and change can be assumed to approximate zero—are neither logical, i.e. violate the axiom of generality in the method of inquiry, nor are they capable of producing meaningful results.

In their own way, all these attempts attest to the realness of our problem—that, namely, of qualitative change or, as it so often inaccurately and vaguely is referred to, of dynamics. It is not

³⁵This statement is made in possible distinction to Mr. Struik's position. Struik says that "the calculus, with . . . its concepts of the *infinite* (italics mine) and the infinitesimal, shows dialectical processes which can be analyzed in minute detail." (I.c., p. 96). The concept of the infinite is sociologically determinable and of a quantitative nature. Of interest in this connection is the analysis of the continuum by the intuitionists and the attempts of the finitists to break down the unverifiable propositions of infinite collections or infinite series. The form in which both schools proceed is undoubtedly idealistic; but it is very much a reality which they express *malgré eux*.

On the other hand, the establishment of a definite relationship between a probability theory and a particular material setting does not necessarily imply that thereby the concept of 'causal nexus' is denied (which is denied in the theory of the logical positivists. Cf. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, New York 1920, p. 109: "Superstition is the belief in the causal nexus"). The formulation on this point by McGill ("An Evaluation of Logical Positivism," *Science and Society*, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 59) is not very clear.

so much on the existence of this problem that there is any doubt left; it is the *method* of expressing and analysing it that is so much debated. The process of arriving at an adequate method necessarily involves two phases: a critical one the main purpose of which is to define and to circumscribe the range of—or the lack of—applicability to the structure of the problem at hand; and a positive one in which a method has to be suggested and applied to a representative problem. This suggestion of a possible method of presenting qualitative change by means of non-quantitative mathematical symbolic logic will be discussed in the second part of this paper to be published in a later issue of this journal.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY G. LOWELL FIELD

Vance, Rupert B., *All These People, The Nation's Human Resources in the South* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945, pp. xxxiii, 503, \$5.00).

This is a remarkable book. Seven years went into the making of it, says the author; to which we should like to reply that the result is well worth whatever it cost in time and effort.

The South has probably been written about more than all the other major regions taken together. We have consequently a good-sized shelfful of volumes on the area, many of them of such high quality that it requires unusual excellence for a book to stand out among them. This unusual excellence we believe marks Vance's latest work so clearly that it must at once be placed at the head of the list.

As the title indicates, the book is about American people, specifically, Americans who live in the South. In four major divisions, we are told about "The Dynamics of Population," "Population and the Agrarian Economy," "Population and the Industrial Economy," and "Cultural Adequacy of the People." The first of these divisions presents the demographic facts relating to the people of the South. They are shown against the background of the country at large, so that the reader may easily see the relationship between the region and the nation. In the second division, the pattern of agrarian life and economy is described in detail. Here we see the South's dependence upon the soil, a soil not too good, farmed by methods far from the best, under a system of tenure not conducive to the building up either of the soil or of a substantial rural population. The third division tells the story of the coming of industry to the South. An elaborate case study shows how the process works. It is evident that more industry will bring great benefits to the South, though not without some detriment as well. The fourth division deals with health and education. The comparisons presented show the South rather better off with respect to health than might be expected, and far behind the rest of the United States in education. This latter condition is not the result of lack of interest in education on the part of Southerners, for the South spends a larger part of its total income on schools than do states in other regions, but low income and a large scholastic population combine to make the effort unavailing. Perhaps with better education the South could raise its income and thus

afford to maintain better schools. The problem is to break the cycle.

The final part of the book deals with policy and planning. Here the author points out the need for controlling the future by preparing for it, by determining in advance what kind of society we desire and then consciously directing our efforts to secure it. For the South asks only that it be included in the National scheme, so that its opportunities may be the same as those of America as a whole.

The description here given suggests, perhaps, but in no adequate fashion summarizes the content of Vance's work. *All These People* is almost encyclopedic. With its multitude of facts, graphs and tables it is undoubtedly the best current reference work on the population of the South.

Even more difficult than a summary is a brief descriptive phrase. Possibly the best comes from the Foreword, wherein the author says, ". . . it is a book about the nation in which we discuss the nation's human resources in the region we know best." The reviewer would like to add to the statement these words: "by the man who best knows the region."

The University of Texas

CARL M. ROSENQUIST

Schuman, Frederick L., *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad*.
(New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946, pp. xxii, 663, index pp. xxv, \$4.00.)

The very wide range of subject-matter and argument in *Soviet Politics* makes difficult a critical appraisal of the work as a whole. It will have one use as an informative introduction to Russian history and politics. Factual material presented on this subject (except for the early periods) is mainly not new, but the treatment is in no sense introductory and represents a notable step in the political analysis of Soviet institutions. Besides the material on Russia as such, much attention is devoted to the problem of world organization and to the mutual adjustments of Soviet-American relations necessary to that end. The argument in addition embraces matters of internal policy in the United States and elsewhere conceived as necessary to the avoidance of excessive pressures toward international war.

In analyzing the internal politics of the Soviet Union Schuman distinguishes clearly between, on the one hand, those aims, goals and accomplishments which make Soviet Communism in its own

setting a movement of democratic character and, on the other hand, the actual governmental mechanisms of the Soviet Union, which are oligarchic. While emphasizing materials in the history of the Revolution which suggest that the one party character of the present-day Soviet institutions was imposed upon them by the necessities of the civil war and foreign intervention and by the associations existing between other parties and the monarchist forces, he nonetheless maintains that at the present time the Soviet system of a wholly planned economy could not function if the introduction of Western political liberties permitted the formation of pressure groups representing different interests. In spite of this analysis he foresees a future development of increasing individual and political liberties in Soviet Russia if the pressure of international rivalry is removed.

As a social system the Soviet Union is characterized by Schuman as distinctive in its lack of any propertied or leisure class rather than in any egalitarianism in other economic matters. While he doubts the attempted demonstrations that diversity of income levels as a whole are greater in the Soviet Union than in Great Britain or the United States, he accepts such contentions with respect to earned incomes taken alone. In effect he considers that the Soviet Union has a ruling class in its "intelligentsia" but he maintains that this group "bears little resemblance to any known aristocracy, plutocracy or theocracy." "Its privileges are strictly contingent upon performance." The self-perpetuation of this class in an hereditary fashion to the exclusion of rising talent he maintains to be a statistical illusion produced by the reduction in the numbers of manual and agricultural workers naturally accompanying the industrialization of the Soviet economy.

In its total accomplishments Schuman considers that the Soviet system has produced two "pearls without price" though these accomplishments "have been bought at a price which few citizens of the Atlantic democracies would be prepared to pay." These primary Soviet accomplishments are "the cure of the mass neuroses of our time through the reintegration of personality around community values and purposes" and "the cure of economic paralysis and stagnation, with their concomitants of wholesale insecurity, frustration and aggression."

Schuman is firmly convinced that the Soviet system is incapable of transplantation into countries which have already become highly industrialized. Its political basis in class war of the propertyless against the propertied can only be established in a feudalistic society with only incipient capitalistic industrialism. Widespread

industrialization, whether under Soviet or capitalistic auspices, brings about "The End of the Proletariat" (part 3, Chapter 12).

But the drive toward larger output with fewer manual workers is inexorable in all industrial societies employing a progressive technology. Under these conditions the "proletariat" constitutes an ever smaller proportion of the population. With rising living standards for the skilled, moreover, many proletarians adopt an outlook approximating that of office-workers and semi-professional employees, who strive in turn to emulate the economic and social élite. (p. 591)

Only in the poorest and most backward neighborhoods of the world is proletarian revolution still within the realm of the possible. (p. 595)

In respect to international organization Schuman maintains that the opportunity for a real world government was temporarily lost when it was not accomplished under the stress of war-time coalition sentiment and that for the time being the only method of avoiding the destruction of civilization by a new war is the maintenance of essential agreement between United States, Soviet and (in less significant degree) British policy. For this purpose he recommends "joint trusteeships" wherever possible and otherwise "lines of demarcation . . . scrupulously respected." (p. 609)

If London and Washington are unable to accept Soviet "mastery" of the Balkan and Danubian lands, or if Moscow is unable to accept Anglo-American mastery of the Western and Mediterranean regions, there will be no peace. (p. 609)

Only the continuance of economic prosperity at home will, according to Schuman, permit the present dominant powers to respect the peace. Since the Soviet economic system gives no signs that it will not continue to work the ultimate problem becomes one of internal organization within the Western democracies.

The basic question upon which hangs the future of war, and the alternatives of salvation or self-destruction for the contemporary world society, is the question of whether the industrial communities of Atlantica can find some other means of keeping men and machines at work. The Soviet way can never be the way of the West. The ways of the past are beyond recapture. The way of Fascist Caesarism has at its destination the organized construction of murder-factories and the scientific conversion of once thriving regions into stinking and rubble-strewn deserts. A new way, combining in its design as much of public planning as is needful for stability, and as much of private property and competitive enterprise as is possible of preservation, must be found if modern man is to escape self-inflicted annihilation. Any contention that such a union of public and private activities is impossible is a threat of a death sentence upon Western culture. (p. 597-598)

The broad theses of this book, as here presented, appear to the reviewer to be incontestable. Their dissemination, indeed, is vitally necessary to the maintenance of peace.

University of Texas

G. LOWELL FIELD

Howenstine, E. Jay, Editor, *Post-War Markets*. (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1945, pp. vii, 184, \$2.00 paper, \$2.50 cloth.)

This book, compiled under the auspices of the American Council on Public Affairs, is based upon official information prepared by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. As stated in the foreword by Amos E. Taylor, it seeks to answer these questions:

First, what will be the total volume of business if most of the people who want to work have productive jobs after the war?

Second, how has the war affected the possibility of reaching that goal? What will be the magnitude of the accumulated demand for goods? How big a backlog of purchasing power exists in the form of extra savings? What obstacles must be overcome?

Third, what opportunities will the estimated national market offer business? How can the market potential for specific products be determined?

The book indicates, "theoretically and concretely, possibilities and probabilities in various leading fields." The theoretical discussion is especially manifest in the first five topics—national outlook, wartime savings, expanding incomes, foreign trade outlook, and market analysis. They bring into play such concepts as capacity production, purchasing power, planning, and the like. The other topics, thirty in number, are particular industries—hand tools, paints, radios, shoes, travel, etc.—and their presentation is as concrete and practical as the risky pastime of prediction permits.

University of Oklahoma

FLOYD L. VAUGHAN

Bush Vannevar, *Endless Horizons*. (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1946, pp. viii, 182, \$2.50.)

Vannevar Bush's many achievements in the physical sciences are highly significant. He has been Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development since its inception in 1942. Mr. Bush's experiences in planning lead him to the conviction that science and the scientific attitude won a global war. He believes, further, that our hope in continued world peace can be sustained through a wise application of science.

We must not be misled into thinking that Mr. Bush has no social political, economic perspective. He realizes that a wise application of science presupposes sound social policy, sound political theory, and sound economic principles.

Mr. Bush advocates federal subsidization as well as general national planning for science in our colleges and universities, both private and public. He believes that the welfare of science cannot be left either to private corporations or to educational institutions if we are to have an effective application of science to its justified end—the improvement of human welfare. There must be, he believes, both direction and financial aid from the top. He is not a communist nor a socialist in the European sense of the word. He does believe that individual initiative and self-expression are consistent with general planning and that it is only through such planning that science can serve best.

Mr. Bush believes that military preparedness (which he hopes will never be challenged) cannot be left wisely to the discretion and direction of the military. Our greatest defense against aggressors is the free, self-initiated, open scientific investigation carried on by interested, unhampered scientists who will, by their very profession, carry on intercommunication with the world-wide community of scientists. Germany failed because she "never established partnership, or anything remotely approaching it, between her military men and her scientists." Of course Mr. Bush contends that such a partnership is impossible under fascism and is possible only in a democracy. But basic scientific research can never be regimented—even by a well meaning military group.

Mr. Bush believes our greatest secret weapon is free communication of scientific knowledge. Basic research—research whose immediate ends or applications are not prescribed by the researcher—must be subsidized by the community at large—by the federal government. It is a treasure for the community at large—by the federal government. It is a treasure for the future; an investment for the welfare of tomorrow and for posterity.

Endless Horizons presents probably the best and only clear informative statements of how we can coordinate science, national defense, international cooperation and government for the betterment of human kind. It gives us a stimulating perspective.

The University of Texas

DAVID L. MILLER

Linton, Ralph, Editor, *The Science of Man in World Crisis*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 532, \$4.00.)

This collaboration of twenty-two authorities in several fields having to do with man and his social manifestations is well worth the consideration of any serious student of contemporary affairs.

Here are presented in concise form (roughly twenty pages each) recent discoveries in disciplines ranging from race and biology to internationalism and war. The stated purpose of the book is to acquaint scientists and planners and the general public with the latest developments in the field of each specialist. "It has been observed that it usually takes about a generation for the new discoveries and techniques of one science to become a part of the regular working equipment of other sciences. It takes considerably longer for such findings to become familiar to the layman and to exert any significant influence upon his thinking. The present book is an attempt to shorten this time interval." (p. vii)

An examination of the titles and authors gives an impression of the scope, content and authorities represented:

- "The Scope and Aims of Anthropology," Ralph Linton
- "Society and Biological Man," H. L. Shapiro
- "The Concept of Race," Wilton Marion Krogman
- "Racial Psychology," Otto Klineberg
- "The Concept of Culture," Clyde Kluckhohn and William H. Kelly
- "The Concept of Basic Personality Structure as an Operational Tool in the Social Sciences," Abram Kardiner
- "The Common Denominator of Cultures," George Peter Murdock
- "The Processes of Cultural Change," Melville J. Herskovits
- "Sociopsychological Aspects of Acculturation," A. Irving Hallowell
- "Present World Conditions in Cultural Perspective," Ralph Linton
- "The Present State of World Resources," Howard A. Meyerhoff
- "Population Problems," Karl Sax
- "The Changing American Indian," Julian H. Steward
- "The Colonial Crisis and the Future," Raymond Kennedy
- "The Problem of Minority Groups," Louis Wirth
- "Applied Anthropology in Colonial Administration," Felix M. Keesing
- "Some Considerations of Indianist Policy," Manuel Gamio
- "Techniques of Community Study and Analysis as Applied to Modern Civilized Societies," Carl C. Taylor
- "The Acquisition of New Social Habits," John Dollard
- "Communications Research and International Cooperation," Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Genevieve Knupfer
- "Nationalism, Internationalism, and the War," Grayson Kirk

Not everyone will be interested in the entire book, and although there is an overall continuity and relationship, each paper is complete in itself. These presentations will have a different appeal to each individual, but they are all excellent and each author speaks with authority.

Social scientists will do well to sample the volume. Particularly to be recommended for their unusually wide appeal are Linton's "Present World Conditions in Cultural Perspective," Kennedy's

"The Colonial Crisis and the Future" and the last two papers. Wirth has the best concise statement on minority groups in print; and Kluckhohn and Kelly have an extremely stimulating discussion of the concept of culture, written in conversational form from varying points of view.

University of Texas

GILBERT McALLISTER

Odum, Howard W., and Jocher, Katharine, Editors, *In Search of the Regional Balance of America*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945, pp. vi, 162, \$3.00.)

Southern sociologists have always been concerned with two major subjects for study: the position of the region in the national and world organization, and the place of the Negro in the region. And nowhere in the area are these fundamental interests focussed more intently than at the University of North Carolina, under the leadership of Howard W. Odum. If southern sociology has made a distinctive contribution to general sociology, it is in the development of regional theory growing slowly from a host of studies of many aspects of the life of the South.

Much of the story of this movement, along with a sampling of the sort of studies encompassed by it, is to be found in a special number of *Social Forces*, re-issued in book form under the above title. Growth of the movement is traced in an historical section made up of articles by the two editors. A second, longer, section contains articles of a more abstract nature by sociologists from a wider area and representing more varied points of view. Here it is interesting to note that two of the articles are primarily concerned with the place of the Negro in the life of the region and that this second major sociological interest appears in some form with more or less emphasis in practically all of the contributions.

Here, then, is not only a valuable example of the regional approach as practiced by the sociologists who have been most active in its development; but here is also an excellent example of the fundamental thesis of the regionalists, the reaction of scholars and scientists to the region within which they find themselves.

University of Texas

HARRY E. MOORE

National Opinion Research Center, *Interviewing for NORC*. (Denver: National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver, 1945, pp. x, 154, \$2.00.)

Just how polling organizations go about collecting the data which later on appear in percentage tables is described in minute detail in this handbook for field workers.

National Opinion Research Center is an endowed polling and research organization operating from the University of Denver. Its methods are not exactly those of Gallup or Roper, but are very similar. In this publication are to be found the instructions and explanations given the field staff as a guide to the conduct and reporting of interviews. In great detail, the worker is instructed as to how he should approach an informant, get the required information and take his departure without influencing the answers given. Numerous and elaborate warnings indicate how easy it is for the interviewer to secure results not truly representative of the attitudes of those furnishing the information.

Although written as an instruction manual for interviewers, the book is of value and interest to anyone interested in the mechanics of public opinion polling.

University of Texas

HARRY E. MOORE

Reid, Joseph W., Jr., *The Units of Government in Alabama*. (University, Ala: University of Alabama Bureau of Public Administration, 1946, pp. viii, 27.)

The title of this pamphlet is expressive of its contents. Dr. William Anderson's definition of a governmental unit has been applied to the many public purpose areas in the state and eight types of units have been identified—the state and its counties, municipalities, school systems, housing authorities, soil conservation districts, drainage districts, and improvement authorities. The student of public affairs, particularly in Alabama, will find the data given for each of these types both useful and interesting.

University of Texas

WILFRED D. WEBB

Books Received

AUGUST THROUGH OCTOBER 1946

Beegle, J. Allan and Smith, T. Lynn, *Differential Fertility in Louisiana*. (n.p.: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College Experiment Stations [Louisiana Bulletin No. 403], June 1946, p. 44.)

Black, Nelms, *How to Organize and Manage a Small Business*. (Norman: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1946, pp. xiv, 367, \$3.00.)

Fesler, James W.; Egger, Rowland; Upson, Lent D.; May, Samuel C.; Ford, Robert S.; Cooper, Weldon; Lambie, Morris B.; Greene, Lee S., *The University Bureaus of Public Administration*. (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Bureau of Public Administration, 1946, pp. 87.)

McCausland, Elizabeth, *The Life and Work of Edward Lamson Henry, N. A., 1841-1919*. (Albany: The University of the State of New York [Now York State Museum Bulletin No. 339], September 1945, pp. 381.)

MacFadden, Clifton H.; Kendall, Henry Madison; Deasy, George F., *Atlas of World Affairs*. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946, pp. vi, 179, \$2.75 text edition.)

Martin, Asa Earl, *History of the United States. Volume II. Enlarged Edition. Since 1865*. (Boston, etc.: Ginn and Co., 1946, pp. xiii, 948, \$4.50.)

Porterfield, Austin L. (assisted in the final chapter by C. Stanley Clifton), *Youth in Trouble: Studies in Delinquency and Despair with Plans for Prevention*. (Fort Worth, Texas: The Leo Potishman Foundation [Publications in the Social Sciences], 1946, pp. 135, \$1.50.)

St.-George, Maximilian and Dennis, Lawrence, *A Trial on Trial, the Great Sedition Trial of 1944*. (n.p.: National Civil Rights Committee, December 1945, pp. 503, \$5.00.)

United States, Civilian Production Administration, *Historical Reports on War Administration: War Production Board: Special Study No.:*

5. Allen, Ethan P., *Hide and Leather Policies of the War Production Board and Predecessor Agencies, May 1940 to December 1943*. Reissued August 1, 1946.

Documentary Publication No.:

1. *Minutes of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, June 12, 1940 to October 22, 1941. 1946.*
2. *Minutes of the Council of the Office of Production Management, December 21, 1940 to January 14, 1942. 1946.*
3. *Minutes of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, September 2, 1941 to January 15, 1942. 1946.*
4. *Minutes of the War Production Board, January 20, 1942 to October 9, 1945. 1946.*
5. *Minutes of the Planning Committee of the War Production Board, February 20, 1942 to April 1, 1943. 1946.*

News Notes

The 1947 annual meeting of the Southwestern Social Science Association will be held at the Baker Hotel, Dallas, Texas, April 4 and 5.

NEW MEMBERS ADDED TO THE ASSOCIATION SINCE SEPTEMBER

Leslie L. Thomason—Gov't.	Wilfred Webb—Gov't.
Southwestern Institute of Technology	University of Texas
Weatherford, Oklahoma	Austin, Texas
C. L. McLaughlin—Econ.	J. Alton Burdine—Gov't.
Austin College	University of Texas
Sherman, Texas	Austin, Texas
A. C. Magee—Ag. Econ.	J. Lloyd Mecham—Gov't.
Texas Agricultural Experiment Sta-	University of Texas
tion	Austin, Texas
College Station, Texas	James Collins—Gov't.
Lerimer E. Storey—Gov't.	University of Texas
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	Austin, Texas
Ruston, Louisiana	Hobart P. K. Sturm—Gov't.
Truman Barber—Bus. Ad.	University of Texas
Trinity University	Austin, Texas
San Antonio, Texas	Allen Z. Gammaye—Gov't.
H. Malcolm MacDonald—Gov't.	University of Texas
University of Texas	Austin, Texas
Austin, Texas	

G. Lowell Field, who has been serving as Book Review Editor for the QUARTERLY for the past year, has resigned from the Department of Government at the University of Texas to accept a position at Wayne University. H. Malcom McDonald of the Department of Government at the University of Texas has agreed to serve as Book Review Editor to succeed Mr. Field.

Mr. Roscoe Adkins has been appointed instructor in history and political science in the University of Arkansas.

Mr. Alvin L. Bertrand has been appointed research assistant in the Department of Rural Sociology at Louisiana State University.

Dr. T. Hillard Cox has been appointed professor of management in the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University. Dr. Cox has been lately associated with the U.S. Department of Commerce, as business consultant in the Kansas City regional office. Prior to that he was with the War Manpower Commission. At one time he was director of the South Dakota state planning board.

John W. Chisholm, formerly of the University of Alabama, is now an instructor in economics in the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University.

Maude Cuenod has come to the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University as an instructor in Business Administration. She formerly taught in the West Texas State College.

George W. Fair has been appointed instructor in accounting in the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University.

Dr. Augustus R. Hatton died in Austin, Texas, on November 12, 1946. Dr. Hatton was Visiting Professor of Government at the University of Texas in 1941-1943. He served from 1907 to 1927 as Professor of Political Science in Western Reserve University, and during 1943 and 1944 was connected with the University of Puerto Rico. At one time, Dr. Hatton was a Charter Consultant for the National Municipal League, President of the Proportional Representation League, and a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, City Council. At the time of his death, he was living in retirement on his ranch in Dripping Springs, Texas.

Mr. Bardin H. Nelson has been appointed instructor in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University.

James M. Owen is now acting as instructor in accounting in the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University. He served four years in the Army.

John P. Owen has returned from advanced graduate work at the University of Wisconsin to serve as instructor in economics in the College of Commerce, Louisiana State University.

Mr. A. I. Riedel, Jr., has been appointed Instructor in Sociology at the University of Arkansas.

While he was in Rio de Janeiro serving as visiting professor at the *Faculdada Nacional de Filosofia*, T. Lynn Smith, of Louisiana State University, was awarded the degree of Doctor "Honoris Causa" by the Universidad de Brasil. This degree was given in recognition of Smith's book, *Brazil: People and Institutions*, recently published by the Louisiana State University Press.

The *Casa do Estudante do Brasil* (National Student Federation of Brazil) has just brought out *Sociologia da Vida Rural*, a Portuguese translation of T. Lynn Smith's *Sociology of Rural Life*.

Mr. Joseph S. Vandiver has been appointed instructor in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University.

Mr. Theo L. Vaughan, Social Science Analyst, previously located at Little Rock, Arkansas, is now at Clemson College, Clemson, South Carolina.

W. A. Guinn has been appointed assistant professor of economics at the University of Arkansas.

H. A. Dulan, formerly with the Federal Reserve Bank in Dallas, has been appointed associate professor of finance at the University of Arkansas.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

E. Clevenger and E. V. Silver have accepted positions in the Department of Accounting.

D. V. Allgeier and L. Freeman have accepted positions in the Department of Business Communications.

H. G. Shuman is returning to the Department of Business Management.

Leon Lee, R. C. Osborn, J. E. Ruse, R. W. Sullivan are new appointees in the Department of Economics. V. G. Wilhite is returning to the department.

B. H. Gildersleeve has accepted a position in the department of Finance.

D. L. Bowen, J. P. Duncan, R. G. Hall, and L. E. Stewart are new members of the Department of Government.

C. C. Bush, H. C. Peterson, A. B. Sears, and S. R. Tompkins have returned to the Department of History. N. M. Bailkey, G. A. Grunder, W. R. Hogan, J. H. Krenkel, D. M. Owings, and H. H. Terry are new appointees in the same department.

John Mertes has accepted a position in the Department of Marketing.

C. W. Berenda has accepted an appointment in the Department of Philosophy.

Carl Oldroyd and Raymond Stone, new appointees, will be in the Psychology Department.

Genieve Janssen and F. G. Fulkerson have been appointed in the Department of Social Work.

E. C. McDonagh has accepted a position in the Department of Sociology.

E. P. Truex has accepted a position in the Department of Statistics.

Mr. Wiley D. Rich has accepted a position at Hardin-Simmons College.